

MEETING OF THE  
U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES  
AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

- -

Mount Vernon Suite 3

Madison Hotel

1177 15th Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C.

Friday, September 15, 2000

The meeting was convened, pursuant to notice, at 1:06 p.m., MARTHA B. GOULD, Chairperson, presiding.

PRESENT:

COMMISSIONERS:

MARTHA B. GOULD, Chairperson

C.E. "ABE" ABRAMSON

JOSE-MARIE GRIFFITHS

JACK E. HIGHTOWER

MARILYN GELL MASON - Commissioner Designate

BOBBY ROBERTS

BEVERLY SHEPPARD, ex officio as Acting Director, IMLS

WINSTON TABB, for Dr. James Billington, The Librarian of Congress

STAFF:

ROBERT S. WILLARD, Executive Director

JUDITH C. RUSSELL, Deputy Director

ELIZABETH E. BINGHAM, Consultant

DENISE DAVIS, Director, Statistics and Surveys

FOREST WOODY HORTON, Consultant

ROSALIE VLACH, Director, Legislative and Public Public Affairs

BARBARA WHITELEATHER, Consultant

GUESTS: EMILY SHEKETOFF, American Library Association

PAYTON NEAL, Software and Information Industry Association

ANN PRENTICE, Association for Library and Information Science Education and  
American Society for Information and Technology

## PROCEEDINGS

### ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

#### CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I'd like to bring the meeting to order, please.

The first item is the Chairperson's report. You received as an information document a report of all of my activities up, I believe, through June. In July I did attend ALA with Bob. It was an interesting meeting. Also, they were most gracious in that the breakfast that we normally have with the Executive Board of ALA included also heads of some of the divisions, and it was extremely pleasant and we talked about all kinds of things, including some library matters.

In August I did go to IFLA. It was really an incredibly interesting conference. I am in the process of writing up the notes, but unfortunately part of my background notes were in the materials that were shipped back with the exhibits and they arrived today. So if you'll bear with me, the total report will probably be mailed out to you next week.

One of the things that happened that had nothing to do with IFLA, but was extremely exciting, is I met with a friend of mine who is in charge of the restoration of the Patriarch Library of the Armenian Orthodox Church. So I spent two days with Silva visiting the library, looking at the incredible logistical nightmare that they lived through to move this library, which in the process of the restoration of two different buildings will be moved I think three different times. Most of the materials are antiquarian and very fragile. The problems were fascinating.

But I also had the honor of an audience with the Patriarch himself, the Archbishop Tukum Manujian, who incidentally happens to be my friend Silva's brother-in-law. So we visited with the Patriarch in his study. Really a fascinating man and very interested in the work of the Commission.

We had to have been with him almost somewhere between a half hour and 45 minutes, and he had a lot of questions that he asked us. It was a wonderful meeting, and hopefully when I get my pictures back they will have come out so that I'll have a visual reminder of what was really an extraordinary interview.

One of the things that fascinated me the most about the two weeks that I spent in Jerusalem, the first week was really personal, although I did spend, as I said, the two days with my friend Silva in this incredible process that they're going through -- there was a

fascinating article in the newspaper in the morning, the English edition of the Israeli daily, the name of which - -

COMMISSIONER TABB: The Jerusalem Post?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: No, it wasn't the Jerusalem Post. It was the other newspaper, and it was the inset in the Herald Tribune, it's English language, and it was an indictment of the status of libraries in Israel, which are in terrible shape. They don't have enough money, their buildings are falling down around their ears. It was fascinating because they refer to themselves, Israelis look upon themselves as "people of the book," and yet the libraries are in absolutely terrible, terrible condition.

When I was in Israel 25 years earlier I did spend quite a bit of time at the public library and evidently things have not improved in 25 years.

The meetings were fascinating. I feel very strongly that NCLIS should have a very visible position when we are at IFLA Boston in 2001. So I would like to put on the table the idea, and we don't have to take any action. But we are doing some very fascinating things. We have the Sister Libraries project, we have some incredible statistical programs that Denise is in charge of. We have the work that Woody has been doing with NTIS, and it's been expanded in terms of government information. I think that these would make excellent programs at IFLA Boston and I think that we should explore that.

The other thing that I found quite interesting is there was a lot of interest in the Commission itself. This goes back to when I was in Austria and Estonia. There are other library commissions worldwide and they do all kinds of different things, but I think we're somewhat unique in that we are created and we speak, not for the profession, but we speak for the right of the public to have access to information.

So there's a possibility that we might want to do something about our Commission because we will have just finished our thirtieth anniversary and that might be a good time, and we are a distinguished partner.

So that really is pretty much my report. I should have the rest of my IFLA thing typed up and I'll fax it to the office and they can get it sent out to everybody. It's going to be a longer report than I thought it would be.

Okay, Bob. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT, INCLUDING IFLA 2000

MR. WILLARD: First of all, I'd like to start out by sharing with you a very serendipitous event that just occurred. We had some problems. I'll talk more in a moment about what's happening on television right now, but I had to run back to the office to take care of a problem and I couldn't take care of it, so the only solution was to go out and buy something new, a VCR, which I did, initiated at the corner, which meant that I was coming back to here at a precise time, just random but a precise time.

At that precise time there was a person getting into a cab, and I said: Mr. Brademas. It was Congressman John Brademas, former Congressman John Brademas, who was apparently here for something and was leaving to go to the airport. Just I get goosebumps thinking about it because here is the guy who introduced the legislation that started the Commission 30 years ago.

So I was able to say hello to him. He asked that I express his greetings to all of you. He was pleased to know that the Commission was meeting here. I just find that quite strange.

(Screen.)

We'll do a quick report. I'll follow the format I've used in the past. These are the topics that seem to keep me occupied most of the time.

In the area of personnel, I can tell you there's been no changes in permanent staff. We're up to full staffing. We've got a good staff on board and I haven't had to do any hiring, which is nice. We've just added a student intern, a high school student who is going to help us in a number of our technology areas.

Let me give you a little bit of where we are with regard to Commissioner appointments. As you know, we've got a number of vacancies. We've got two vacancies caused by deaths with Gary Suduth and Jeanne Simon. We have two more vacancies that took place a year ago with Joel Valdez and Frank Lucino. Then we have the most recent vacancy of Mary Furlong.

Now, in addition, on July 19th last month, two months ago, three more Commissioners went into or would have gone into their cycle, their one-year cycle. One of those three was Joan Challinor. She has been reappointed.

Also, when I was talking about the three vacancies from last year with Joel, Frank, the other person appointed that year was Bobby and Bobby has subsequently been reappointed, although there was a short break in service.

We know now that the White House has announced that Marilyn, her name will be sent up to the Senate. It should have been done before. The announcement was made in the White House -- actually, if you saw the press release, it said "Aboard Air Force One." I don't believe it, but that's where he was at the time the press release came out, so it says "Aboard Air Force One." It announced his intention to nominate.

Well, the next step is an actual nomination, which is a transmittal of a document to the Senate. That has not occurred yet, but I was assured by White House personnel that it will happen next week, along with another person that has not been announced yet.

Now, there are two others that are well along in vetting and there are two others that are not so well along in vetting. The problem of course, as everyone recognizes, is that

Congress is talking about getting out of here by the middle of -- well, by October 7th, they say. But let's be realistic: by the middle of October. It will take a herculean effort to get the nominations through, but we're going to make the attempt.

(Screen.)

In the area of appropriations, there is a bill that has money for the Commission and it is in conference committee now. It's passed both houses. In the House version it's \$1.3 million, the same amount as this year. In the Senate version it's 1.5. In the draft conference report it does come in at the Senate amount of 1.5. So that would be about a 15 percent increase on top of our 30 percent increase from last year. So in two years we will have gone from just a little bit under a million to a million and a half.

We are working right now on the FY 2002 submission. As you may recall, that is treated with great confidentiality until the President releases the number next -- well, next February probably. We will be providing to the Commissioners by mail a copy of what we send to OMB, but with a warning that it is confidential information.

MS. RUSSELL: Do you want to explain that process, Bob?

MR. WILLARD: Yes. This for me is the first time through a transition from one administration to the other. Even if it remains in the same party, it still is a transition. The OMB asks that we submit a pro forma budget with increases just pegged to certain percentages. Well, we didn't follow that instruction because we still believe that -- and I think it's from direction from the Commissioners historically -- that we want to build that budget higher. So the number we put in will be higher.

But it's pro forma. There's not a lot of justification material attached to it because the current administration will leave. A new budget submission built on the pro forma will be submitted in January and of course then we'll know who we're dealing with.

Also, just an aside with regard to a new administration. Both candidates, major candidates, have transition teams already beginning to do a little work. Once the election takes place, one of those teams then gets to do a lot of work. I anticipate that the Commission will endeavor to get to know who those people are.

I did learn after I started in this job that the transition team looking at the Commission last time was headed by Mike Nelson, the guy who then we met with with the Vice President back in '95. He told me that the recommendation out of the transition team was: Strengthen it or do away with it. Now, they didn't do either as far as I'm concerned, but I think it is important to recognize that during that little period of time from election day to inaugural all sorts of things are being considered about the structure of government, and it would be a mistake for us not to at least try to weigh in on that.

With regard to publications, since the last time we have gotten the hearing report. The brochure, as you know, came out right away. The hearing report is now tangible, and I

can assure you that it has been delivered to every single member of the U.S. Congress because I hand carried them up there.

The other two reports that we've had on our agenda for a while are still in process and I hope before too long I will be able to report that these are completed, but right now they are not. We've got one new report, one new publication that you're not aware of, and I will say more about it in the context of the effort that Woody is leading on government information.

But the Commission did a major study back in the beginning of the eighties on the proper role of the public sector and the private sector in the dissemination of government information. In reviewing that document, it is just astounding how solid it is, how well it holds up. So we are going to reproduce it with just some minor editorial amendments and maybe some additional back matter like legislative proposals and documents that have taken place since that time, but basically as a working tool for Woody's project.

Statistics. Well, basically the rest of the meeting is a description about projects, so I'm not going to say too much about statistics because Denise will be reporting. But I just want to -- I'm a broken record on this, but I think we're so lucky to have Denise on the staff that I can't stop saying that. She just brings great credibility to our effort.

Sister Libraries, Rosalie and Beth will be reporting on that, good progress there.

GPO study. In April the first two -- the GPO study going into NTIS. Last fall or just about this time last year when the Department of Commerce announced the proposed closing of NTIS, the Commission recognized that this is really an opportunity to weigh in. Well, our weighing in has been well received and in fact when we submitted the preliminary assessment on NTIS the recommendation to Congress was, take your time studying this and study it in an overall framework of information policy.

Thankfully, they said: Good idea. And a couple of different members said "good idea." John McCain, who as chairman of the Commerce-Science Committee is concerned about science information as part of his jurisdiction, asked us to get involved. Then Joe Lieberman in his role as chairman -- I keep saying that -- ranking Democrat on the Gov Ops, whatever, Governmental Affairs, who has basically the federal information policy responsibility within the Congress.

Meanwhile, Woody in his traditional way has made sure that every other entity within the Congress that is concerned about this knows we're involved. He's got a mailing list of all the key staffers. I think we have just gotten some contact out of the House side also encouraging us to move and supporting the study. Woody will be here in a while to discuss this in greater detail.

White House conference, essentially nothing. The White House handed over the idea to a staffer. Contact with that staffer has not been productive. I still will echo what I said at the last meeting: It will be a big mistake for the current incumbent of the White House to



leave without saying something about libraries, and I still want to keep the pressure on that, reminding him that he spoke at the first White House conference in 1979.

Strategic planning, I will confess there's absolutely has been done on that since the last time we got together. We put forth basically a PowerPoint presentation on where we were at the point, but that is an issue. It's a project area that does require more effort both on the part of staff and also on the part of Commissioners, and it hasn't happened yet.

One additional thing that we're doing, and it sort of makes a lot of sense for somebody who's an organization, an agency that's concerned with information, is we're now trying to get a better handle on the information about ourselves. In many cases we don't have files, we have piles, and it's just astounding how much good information about the activities of the Commission over the years we have, but the formal archiving of it and turning it over to the Library of Congress -- the Library of Congress; not the Library of Congress -- to the National Archives and Records Administration, we haven't done well.

We are now doing that. We've engaged a professional archival consultant. We are developing the schedules that we should have had all along. It's not a project that is easy or quick, but I think you will be quite proud of our ability to provide the documentary record of this agency. It'll be a couple of years, but we're working hard on that.

Meetings, just a couple of things. I went to - - the National Academy of Sciences had two two-day meetings, basically brainstorming sessions, and they were wonderful, helping them to decide what, if anything, they should do on two topics: one, the digital divide, that is the question about the information have's and have-not's; and two, digital democracy, the use of electronic technology to participate more in government both as a voter, a participant in the process, and also as a customer, as a receiver of governmental services.

I did sit in on a couple of IMLS review panels. My summer was spent with alphabet soup. I went to I think just about every one of the library association meetings, especially -- where is that? ALA. I guess in between -- yes, in between I went to the LSTA task force, which you heard a little bit about from Mamie this morning.

Then I did have ALA especially because not only I, but probably a third of the Commission members were there. There were so many activities going on in that context, including the traditional meeting we have with the board. But as Martha pointed out, it was expanded. She was somewhat humble in not pointing out that it was also done in her honor as the new Chair of the Commission.

Finally, IFLA. Martha's offered some comments and she will give you a report that I'm sure will get into the nitty-gritty. I want to give sort of just a -- and Winston also as somebody who attended it might have some things to say about it. But I think Americans are probably spoiled when it comes to library association meetings. Just look higher on the list and you can see all the things that anybody who wants to can take advantage of.

That's not the case with the rest of the world, and for many nations the IFLA meeting is the best they have in terms of professional development. So in that context, I thought it was wonderful, and also in the context of the ability to maintain personal relationships with people in other nations over time. I think that's extremely valuable.

That said, I left that meeting not very satisfied. I think the political overlay was a problem, simply, the Arab-Israeli conflict and the fact that a number of nations boycotted it. But I can't quite put my finger on it, but it didn't leave me feeling the same way I did after I left Amsterdam and Bangkok. I'm thinking more about that.

But, that further said, I am extremely grateful that I am in the position I am and had the opportunity to walk the streets of Jerusalem, because I had never been there before and to see -- to me, Christian background, to walk through the Garden of Gethsemane is just an astounding thing. So I thank you for the opportunity of visiting there. It was an amazing place to be.

(Screen.)

There's the set of the Doctor Laura Show, and as we speak in Washington, D.C., the show is being broadcast on Channel 20. I hope you have all had a chance to read my e-mail on it. It was an absolutely phenomenal experience. I found that, rather than being apprehensive about it, I went in it like a gladiator who charged. I had so much fun on it, except for the fact that I didn't feel there was the adequate time to discuss the thing fully and appropriately.

But we'll see what they did with the editing. You never know. In fact, there was an announcement -- I mean, not an announcement, on her web page today, a description of it, said that it would include a Congressman who was sponsoring legislation. Well, they told me that Istook was out, but I know if I were a Congressman's aide and I found out that he was cut I'd be on the phone and say: You made him leave the Republican Convention a day early, you made him fly all the way across the country, and he's not going to be on? So we'll see.

As I say, it's happening right now.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Also, if any of you saw this morning's Washington Post, there was a very interesting critique of Doctor Laura's Show. I guess the overwhelming attitude is: Boring.

MR. WILLARD: The studio audience was like they were asleep. But nonetheless -- oh, and I've said this to a few of you, but my principal objective in this whole thing was to get on the record that there was a Commission and that we spoke for the people of the United States when it came to library and information activities, and if they didn't cut that I did get that on the record.

MS. RUSSELL: And we'll have the opportunity, anybody who's still here, to go back to the office afterwards and see the tape, assuming that the new VCR works.

MR. WILLARD: Assuming that the new VCR worked.

MS. RUSSELL: So stay tuned.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: What Bob also didn't tell anyone -- I think many of us have seen it -- is this incredible letter that he wrote to Doctor Laura following the first taping, which I think is now up on a number of listservs.

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It's an absolutely fantastic letter.

MR. WILLARD: Every now and then -- as a matter of fact, thanks to this little device here and a cross-country flight, I had the opportunity to really put some effort into a single letter.

So that's what's been keeping me kind of busy. At that point I'll conclude and ask if there are any questions or comments.

(No response.)

#### NCLIS MEETING CALENDAR, INCLUDING IFLA 2001 IN BOSTON, MA

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you.

If you turn to tab B, we have the meeting calendar for next year, the rest of this year and into next year. So I do want you to go through it, if there are any changes. There are some things here where no one is really going to be attending.

In October I will be in Omaha. I will also be going first, though I'm not quite sure how we're going to work this one out -- I wish that I could just say "Beam me up, Scottie, or transport me" from Reno to Springfield, Illinois, to Omaha, Nebraska, and then on to Los Angeles, where I'll be part of the presentation of the National Library Services Award to the Simon Wiesenthal Library.

Also, at some point in October I will be going to Alabama to Silicagua.

MR. WILLARD: Silicagua.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Silicagua, for their presentation. I guess I fly into Birmingham, and then Beverly and I are going to figure out how we can meet and drive together to Silicagua.

COMMISSIONER SHEPPARD: First we find out where it is.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Oh, I know where it is. It is one hour south-southeast of Birmingham on a major highway. I looked it up on the map.

MS. RUSSELL: Martha, I'm assuming, because the time here doesn't permit it, that you and I will do the same exercise we did last year, which is if each of you look at this, if there are any meetings you would like to attend, if there are meetings you would like to attend and plan to attend that aren't on here, and feed them back in. Then once we know what our appropriation is --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We will work out who goes where.

MS. RUSSELL: We'll go through, as we did last year, and try to give you each a schedule of what is pre- approved in the way of travel, and then we'll do it ad hoc after that. But that way we'll at least start with a base of knowing.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We'll also need to think in terms of our next meetings. For those who were here this morning, you know that I floated the idea of our doing perhaps a hearing as part of this whole effort for the reauthorization of the Museum and Library Services Act. I still feel very strongly, and I'm not going to back down on this one, on holding a hearing on information literacy and the role of school libraries and the status of school libraries, because I think these dovetail and they also address the issue of the digital divide.

So those are two things that I think are very important for us to consider doing in the next 12 to 14 months.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Are we planning a meeting next mid-winter, in January?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: No, normally we don't because it's just too crushed. I think our schedule -- though some of us will be here for midwinter, but we won't have a formal. We probably will do an executive committee meeting.

MS. RUSSELL: We were talking also, because of Woody's study which we're going to hear about after we talk about the calendar, about the possibility of a meeting around the middle of November, because that's the point when most of the inputs to the Commission will have been completed. Then we have a month from there until December 15th to do the report and turn it in to Congress. So that might be an opportune time, if not in person certainly by conference call, to get the Commission involved in discussions on what are the policy recommendations that they want to take out as inputs and actually turn into the report.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It's possible because, Beverly, the meeting that you're having on the 21st Learner --

COMMISSIONER SHEPPARD: 9th and 10th of November.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And it may be that we can do that meeting, and some of us may want to stay on the attend that conference, which I think is also very important, and again dovetails in the whole issue of the role of school libraries and information technology.

COMMISSIONER TABB: Could I ask, are any of the meetings for fiscal '01 set yet?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: No, we have not set the dates yet and that's something that we have to do. We'll probably just float some dates, get them out to everybody. It might help if you take a look at your calendars, say through the end of June, and highlight when you're going to be available so we can try and pull the logistics together.

MS. RUSSELL: Or inversely, places where you know you can't be available so we can work around them.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

MR. WILLARD: Also, there was a comment made, I think, at the last meeting that if we continue to be in a situation where we don't have enough Commissioners to really hold a business meeting that then we'll probably do more sort of ad hoc activities with maybe small committees or an executive committee. No sense in bringing everybody together when you don't have enough to have a vote.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: There is certainly enough on our plate right now that we can continue to do a lot of very substantial work, even if we don't have a formal meeting.

MS. RUSSELL: Would it be appropriate, Martha, to consider, if we were having a reauthorization hearing, to try to have it around the time of Library Legislative Day, when there are so many librarians in town already from different places? I mean, I know there's so much that goes on right then that maybe there's too much else going on.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Let's explore that, because there again if we can do something when a lot of people are going to be around that makes a lot of sense. So let's explore that. I like that idea.

MR. WILLARD: But counterbalance that with the fact that Congress itself can hold hearings here in Washington. They can hold hearings anywhere they want, but they do hold hearings here in Washington, and what our contribution might be, as we did with the '95 hearing in Lake Tahoe, is that we have the ability to go out and get local people.

MS. RUSSELL: Where is the ALA summer meeting next year?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: San Francisco.

Beverly.

COMMISSIONER SHEPPARD: In the report that we sent over just on general activity of the Office of Library Services, we also mention that November 15th to 17th is the second annual LSTA management conference, where we bring in the heads of the state library agencies or the state library coordinators for updates on our program. It may be again, if the November meeting is put in place, you might have the opportunity to see some of that. I think it's very effective.

I also think in terms of holding hearings it might be very wise to do some of this gathering of information at regional meetings as a preface.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, yes.

MS. RUSSELL: I thought the old Sturbridge issue --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Actually, I love the idea of going to Sturbridge. First of all, I can fly into Hartford and I get to see my sister, who spends a lot of time with the Commission now and is also a very strong financial supporter of some of our activities, which is even nicer.

What about the meeting next year? Do we always have to meet in September, because of the problem of it being so close to the end of the federal fiscal year?

COMMISSIONER SHEPPARD: I think that there is nothing that says we do. From the point of view of museums, October is the time of all of the regional museum meetings across the country and they go from the beginning of October to the end, which really means that staff and all are pretty much out for that whole month. That takes you into November, and again it's just planning time, I think.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: In looking at the calendar - - and I think I made a note of it; I may not have -- I believe the High Holy Days -- I thought I made a note of when they come next year, but I think they come at the very end of September.

MS. RUSSELL: The 30th.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I think Rosh Hashanah.

MS. RUSSELL: Is on the 30th.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: All right, then it starts the 29th.

MS. RUSSELL: Yom Kippur is the 9th of October.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: So that probably won't be a consideration then next year because it comes at the end of the federal fiscal year.

MR. WILLARD: The law simply requires that the Commission shall meet not less than one time each year in a joint meeting. So in fact if you use calendar year as your definition we could satisfy it by having a meeting in January, not that I'm suggesting that.

COMMISSIONER MASON: If there's going to be an IFLA in Boston, would it make sense to try to do it near that?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: To have a meeting before or after IFLA?

MS. RUSSELL: We had talked about trying to hold a Commission meeting near Boston around the time of IFLA and then having some of the Commissioners go on to IFLA.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I guess we'll just have to play around with it, but I would appreciate your giving us some feedback as to when you are available over, say, through the end of June, July, so that we can start trying to put a calendar together. It's a little bit like herding cats, trying to get everybody in the same place at the same time.

MS. RUSSELL: Do you already have a schedule of the Museum Services Board meetings next year?

COMMISSIONER SHEPPARD: We'll be meeting the end of January. We'll be meeting in St. Louis in conjunction with the American Association of Museums probably in May. That's mid-May. So the distribution of September, January, May makes a lot of sense for that particular group.

I think the only problem with IFLA as I look at this is that a lot of the world is on vacation at that time and it may be somewhat difficult to get a host of people together.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Okay. Are there any other comments, concerns, questions before we move on from the calendar?

(No response.)

Would you look at the various meetings and get in to Judy what you're particularly interested in. APPROVAL NCLIS DRAFT MINUTES, APRIL 10-12, 2000; FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000; AND NOVEMBER 3-5, 1999

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We have draft minutes for April and the February meetings, February -- well, actually April of 2000, February of 2000, November of 1999. As we do not have a quorum, we cannot take any action at this point. We will probably do a mail ballot. So read, please, the minutes and get any comments back to Judy.

Any questions, concerns? And then we'll be doing the mail ballot.

(No response.)

MR. WILLARD: I should point out that the attempt with the minutes now is, at least for the foreseeable future, my hope that we will always do a transcript, as we are doing at this meeting. Therefore we will have a full transcript available for anyone who wants to see it, and our minutes, it is my hope, will be briefer and simply record the major events, major decisions, major discussions.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And the transcripts, of course, will be a permanent record and I really like that.

Judy, do you want to take us over the financial report under tab B?

#### NCLIS FINANCIAL REPORT

MS. RUSSELL: Yes, the last item there under tab B. We are rolling down here now to the very end of the fiscal year. If you look at the table, if you look at the two right-hand columns, the available percentage and available balance, we have under payroll about \$65,000 left as of the 1st of September, which is just within \$1500 of what we need to finish out the payroll, including our estimates of your expenses for this trip for payroll.

If anybody hasn't turned in your blue form, I'd like to take this opportunity to say I'd like your salary forms today.

We have about \$45,000 as of the 1st of September. We've actually been spending a little of this, obviously, in the intervening two weeks. But for other expenditures, the primary large categories that are still open, we are in the process of buying a new server for the Commission.

Those of you who are interested in technology will appreciate the fact that we're using a 486 that was in its day a high-end PC as our server. It was not ever a machine that was really meant to be a server. As the staff has grown and our communications with the outside world have improved, we really felt we needed to step up the both having a new fileserver, but also getting a server that will let us run Microsoft Outlook in a way that will let us share calendars, share address files, set up more kinds of an intranet type service that all of you remotely can tap into to upload and download documents and so forth

We've actually been working on a series of different proposals on that since we made the decision to do it in March. It looked for a while like we might actually work with the Department of Education and actually piggyback on some of what they were doing and get the benefit of the expanded set of hardware and software support, until we found out that they wanted us to put in a \$50,000 server closet before we even bought the server or did anything else.



So now we've gone back to our earlier, more modest plan for an independent server of our own, but we will upgrade the speed of our connection to the Internet and by expanding our capability and, as you hear the things that Denise is talking about and Woody and others, that we're increasingly using the web site as a means to communicate with the outside world about the Commission.

So we really want to upgrade that technology, so we've been holding a little pocket of money there, which will probably be obligated next week, and we've been holding a little money back on printing in the expectation that we'll probably drop the annual report in the hopper right before the end of the fiscal year.

But we've stayed within our resources carefully, as usual. It certainly helped having a little more meat on the bone this year.

If you look down below the midpoint, you'll see that the gift account, which started the year with 7,000, we ended up with a total of 18.7 for the year. Some of that was money that was raised for the National Award for Library Services and then expended out for part of the reception. Some of it was money that came in in memorial for Joan -- or Jeanne, excuse me, and some for the Sister Libraries project.

But we will be carrying over a substantial amount of that money. That's the one category in which we can carry over money and, since we cannot do food service with appropriated funds, particularly in the Sister Libraries area, the Sister Libraries teas and things, that will finance some of that money.

Denise will give you a report of the operations of the statistics program, but this year we had an MOU for \$225,000 and as of yesterday we had a signed MOU from the State Department for the SICA money. So it's come in extremely late, but by Monday we will be able to obligate the SICA money. It's all allocated. We have determined where all those funds are going, but we've been sitting there wondering if we were going to have to write letters to people saying, well, we really intended to give you this money, but in fact the paperwork -- I faxed the final piece of paperwork back to Ed after 5:00 o'clock last night.

So we finally do have money for that. I'd be happy to answer any questions that you have about it. It's pretty much laid out the way they've been laid out before. Any particular questions you're looking at?

(No response.)

## NCLIS RENOVATIONS

MS. RUSSELL: Let me talk then, because it relates to the spending of money also, about a couple of other things that we're doing related to the suite. The last time you all were here we actually met in a suite adjacent to the office with the double glass doors and a nice blue carpet. It was vacant and we were sort of camping out in there. We've actually

been camping out in there quite a lot, particularly for meetings related to Woody's study as well.

We are waiting for the paperwork from GSA to actually take on that space. Then they think it will take four to six weeks to get the permits and the final drawings for consolidating the space we have with that space.

MR. WILLARD: Some of the space we have.

MS. RUSSELL: Some of the space we have. We'll give back about a third of the space we have and we'll pick up space in what we call the blue suite. That will let us have a more formal reception area, where people get off the elevator and they can actually tell we're there without having to peer around corners, and it will give us a conference room. It will mean for future meetings we'll have adequate space to have Commission meetings on site. So it will give us a much improved working environment.

We'll also have a layout for the first time that's really space that we've designed for ourselves, instead of just moving into someone else's space and trying to adapt to what they had laid out.

We're using a little bit of our year end money to transfer to GSA for some of the renovations, so we'll take on the rest with next year's money. It'll be a modest thing. It'll come in probably under \$150,000. We're still waiting for the final estimates on the final drawings for renovating the suites. The carpeting in both suites is over seven years old, so we are going to go to the expense of having a new carpet put in while we're doing it. So we'll start with a nicer environment.

Then, of course, furnishing the conference room so we'll have a work space. We did not try to meet there because we are already here and set up and it seemed easier, and because we're getting new neighbors on that floor. The Food and Drug Administration is in the process of spreading out from some of the other floors of the building, and so it seemed like people might be moving desks up and down the halls and the elevators might be tied up, and it seemed like it was tempting fate to try to schedule the meeting there.

The other thing we've done in conjunction with that, and it sort of ties back to the thirtieth anniversary, is we've looked at kind upgrading and modernizing our logo. So we have a newly designed logo. I'll have Bob hold that for a minute. We've been trying to play up more the idea of "NCLIS" because that's how people know us, and nine out of ten people who have heard of NCLIS -- no, no, you've got it right -- couldn't tell you what the initials stood for. They could get to maybe National Commission on Libraries, and then they sort of wander off.

I don't know if any of you have ever looked, as I have, at our stationery and mailing labels, but we have stationery with the White House eagle and we have the old logo on the envelopes and nothing at all -- no, the mailing label had the logo and the envelopes are plain, but they were different formats, different styles of type.

So we're going to have a whole new look in stationery. We're going to have envelopes and mailing labels and stationery, and we'll begin to try to create a kind of a look for the Commission.

You can pass those around and let people look at them. This is a large version of the logo.

In the process we're also, for our new conference room facility, going to have mugs, which will be in by the end of the month, which will have a more elaborate looking logo. It will actually be on both sides.

MR. WILLARD: The reason for that I think that needs to be mentioned is we do get visitors, especially from foreign countries, who invariably bring little gifts with them and we don't have anything to give back.

MS. RUSSELL: Actually, it turned out to be no more expensive to have ones that had our names on it, really, than to get the ones that didn't. So we're going to have things that look nice, and we're also going to have some glassware, and we'll give each of you a set of those so that you'll have some for yourselves, so that we will again have, when we do have a meeting and we put out water or whatever, we will look a little more professional, a little more like -- a little corporate image, a little sense of who we are and where we're going.

So we've used a very modest amount of money this year to begin that process of setting up a new look for the communications that we do, and I think it would help. We're also looking at now, if you look at the web site, the new logo's on the first page, and it'll begin to move through as we begin to redesign some of the web pages. A little crisper, more modern look.

And we do have a design for the business cards. So if any of you are at a point where you need to order business cards or if you would like to get the new look, talk with me and we'll get it set up and we'll get a group order together and go ahead and print new Commission business cards.

We also ordered some little note cards -- I hoped they would be in today, but they're not ready -- that we will be able to use for things like the Sister Libraries teas, but also if you visit a member of Congress and want to write a personal thank you note or someone's done something that you need to acknowledge, something that's more appropriately done with a handwritten note, we'll have a very nice-looking note card that can be used. So we'll give you all a supply of those as soon as they're available, too, so that you can begin to use those.

So we'll get an e-mail out and get in touch with all of you about whether you'd like to order some new business cards and sort of start getting into this new image.

I was talking to Bob about the fact that I think we'll start replacing these guys, too. I was looking at the IMLS ones today with the logo on it and we might do white ones with our color logo and spruce ourselves up a little and try to begin to get a little more formal.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: And we do get a lot of foreign visitors who come to the Commission. Joan is our international liaison person and I wish she were here today. Unfortunately, she isn't. But it's very nice for us to be able to reciprocate, and I think as time passes we're going to see more and more visitors coming to the Commission offices.

Before we go on to the next item of business, I want to pause and acknowledge the fact that we have a guest from the Museum Services Board with us this afternoon, Jerry Florence. I'm delighted that you were able to stay for a while and see what we do.

With that, I'd also like our guests to introduce themselves, please.

MR. NEAL: Payton Neal, the Software Information Industry Association.

MS. PRENTICE: Ann Prentice, Association for Library and Information Science Education and American Society for Information and Technology.

MR. TREVILION: Maurice Trevilion, Chief, Office of State Library Agencies.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We're delighted that you were able to join us today.

We also note that Abe Abramson is back from the White House counsel's office. I hope everything is fine.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: They didn't indict me.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I am delighted.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I assume that the presence of the Museum Board member means that it's clear now that we might, as it's convenient, attend some of their meetings. There was an initial point in IMLS' history when it was at least suggested it would be awkward for us to attend some of your meetings.

COMMISSIONER SHEPPARD: Not that I know of, not that I know of. You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We attend all the time.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Abe, maybe that was more personal.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: No, that was before you were here.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Now the truth comes out.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Neither one of you were here in those earlier fun meetings.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Enough. We are right on time.

#### REVIEW, NCLIS/NMSB MEETING

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: The next order of business is a review of our joint board meeting. Does anyone have anything to say? I found it extremely useful this morning. I was delighted that -- in fact, I found myself feeling that I wished we'd had more time because just when the discussion got going and there was a lot of, I think, very good input given to the staff, we had to move on.

So maybe when we work on the joint meeting next year we can look at more time for substantive discussion.

COMMISSIONER SHEPPARD: I might suggest something as a possible model for that since there is a lot of content always to be caught up on, which is basically what a lot of the morning was, was kind of bringing that thinking to a common plane here and awareness. It might be useful to do that in a morning session, break for lunch, and take one more hour that could be reflections on, you know, guidance points for the programs to consider that would reflect what we had learned during the morning opportunity.

I think that there were implied many areas for us to think about and respond to, as in Abe's interest there in talking about allocation of funds and percentage. It might have been nice to take that break and come back and come to those specific items that we can respond to and perhaps report back. So that's a possible model.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I know I was very frustrated because I wanted to get more into the leadership grants and the arena of education, because they have been -- you've already announced those. We never really quite got to that point.

COMMISSIONER SHEPPARD: I wonder if it might be helpful just to make a comment about the education and research grants. The reason that they had been announced was input from panels saying that many of these then could be put in place with the beginning of the academic year, and by not announcing that one until mid-September they lost at least the first half of the year in implementation.

As you look at those grants -- and they're all posted on our web site -- one of the things that was very exciting to me about these particular programs this year is that some of them are tremendously innovative and far-reaching in terms of reaching out to meet the needs of diverse professionals, that we have a much broader kind of series of programs that are looking at training librarians more in terms of the world that we work in, that really reflect the constituents that they're working with. There are some really very, very fine programs.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It seems to me when I looked at the web page that one of the grants dealt with a mentoring project and I found that very interesting.

COMMISSIONER SHEPPARD: A very, very good program, some that are really beginning and some school-based programs that are teaching students in school in a mentoring way, that also then connects with their ongoing education. Just a lot of very, very thoughtful programs.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Good.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: It's interesting that the schools give you that input, because they've been giving input to the school library media study for years and they still insist on sending that to them early in September when they're busy, and every time I talk to a school librarian they say: I'm not going to fill that out unless I get it in February. And yet I know that input has gone back through. It's nice that you react.

COMMISSIONER SHEPPARD: Well, we try to respond to it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, Jack.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: I don't know whether I slept through or ignored a fax or e-mail, but I picked up a while ago that Joan Challinor had had a bad accident. Could you tell us a little? How is Joan?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Joan is fine. The reason she's not here today is that she is currently the chair of the Knight-Ritter board and unfortunately the Knight-Ritter board was scheduled to meet in San Jose, which is now their headquarters, at the same time as this meeting, and as the chair it was a little difficult for her not to be present.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: I'm more concerned about her health.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Her health is fine, it is fine. She unfortunately took a fall.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: On the golf course.

MS. DAVIS: On the golf course, split her head open.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: She's sort of like this (indicating), and I believe it took something like 22 stitches, and she was hospitalized, I think just overnight. But she could not travel. She's fine now. There are no problems and you have to look very carefully to even see the scar at this point.

MS. RUSSELL: For getting such a big whack on her head, she didn't even get a concussion. It was such an enormous whack on the head, but she said she was so hardheaded.

MR. WILLARD: She called me from the operating room to let me know that she wouldn't be able to make a meeting later that day.

MS. RUSSELL: She had expected to make the meeting anyway.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Only Joan.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I sent her a note that said I was glad to hear that it had hit her in the head, because from what I heard if it hit her anywhere else that hard it would have killed her.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: But she is fine.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Were we told by e-mail?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: No. She didn't really --

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: She didn't want anybody to know about it?

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Until it was all over and done with.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: That's good. I was glad I didn't miss it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: In a way it was interesting, because she had to cancel going to IFLA, and when Beth makes her report on IFLA, my sister ended up, we put her to work in the booth, which was very nice.

Are there any other comments about the meeting this morning? Jerry, would you like to say anything?

MR. FLORENCE: Well, you know, being fairly new to the Museum Services Board and coming in with IMLS, I had never thought of the two groups really separate, with the sense of collaboration and the missions being very overlapping like you described this morning, Beverly. I thought that -- and I think it's very, very important that the joint meetings do happen and that we do have time to discuss things, because I think there is so much importance of a collaboration between the two groups that I really don't think of myself separately as a part of just the Museum Services Board.

I look at my role to support both agendas and visions of where we want to go. So I think it's extremely important. That's why I wanted to have the opportunity and appreciate the opportunity of your inviting me to sit in, because I think it's important that we understand and support one another. To me, it's a shared report.

I thought the meeting was great, and I agree, let's leverage those as best we can, because I think we'll get much more substantive stuff out of it if we can do that. I thought it was great.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you. Our pleasure.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: The idea to have the combined Institute was not the idea of anyone who's been in this room, and if we follow the British model pretty soon we'll add sports.

MS. RUSSELL: The baseball commissioner can have his own little board.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: We will give them general policy advice once a year and baseball cards.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Absolutely. I want you to know that the second time in my entire life that I went to a professional baseball game was at our meeting in San Diego. And I left, I think, at the end of the fourth inning.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: The third quarter.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It's not that I didn't quite get it; I just found it boring.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Well, you weren't sitting with the Librarian of Congress, who managed to offend the home plate umpire, and that's putting it mildly.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Do we have any other substantive comments to make on the meeting this morning?

(No response.)      DISCUSSION, NCLIS 30TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Then with that, we will go on to the next item and that will be the discussion of our thirtieth anniversary celebration. If I remember correctly, we do have a committee.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Yes. Well, the committee is gone, but is subject to resuscitation. I fortuitously, right after we had our meeting here and being put on this committee, I was with President Carter. So I had the bright idea to suggest perhaps that



maybe the Carter Center would like to put on a symposium on the digital divide and work with us to do it and in that way celebrate our thirtieth anniversary.

He said: Jack, that sounds very interesting and I'm sure we'd be interested. Why don't you call so-and- so. And I got my pen out and got his name and address down, and I wrote him a letter, and thus endeth the report.

I also sent Bob a copy of it. Bob is a good goad.

MR. WILLARD: I made a few calls, but thus ends the report.

I think certainly if there is a desire, which hasn't been manifested so far, the Carter Center would be a great venue for the sort of event that we were talking about, focusing on the digital divide. Again, speaking about who was at the first White House, and the former director of the first White House conference can tell you, President Carter was very deeply involved. His presentation was from the heart. There's no doubt it had been carefully scripted, but nonetheless it expressed a very strong belief in the contribution libraries can make to individual lives.

It's on the list is all I can say, and we need to put a little bit more muscle into moving it along. One of those things about anniversaries is if we wait too long it's gone, which is why I'm glad we have this wide window from July 20th, two months ago, to September 21st a year from now, because that was the period between the enactment of the legislation and when the Commission was actually assembled and had its first meeting.

But I think the purpose of putting the topic on the agenda for this meeting was just to continue to keep it alive and to also hope that it might spur some thoughts on the members' part of additional things we might consider doing and spur me.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Perhaps someone would have a better idea about how to motivate the Carter Center into taking us up on the offer.

MS. RUSSELL: We could go back to the President and say: That wasn't successful; could you suggest someone else? Politely, obviously.

MR. WILLARD: Or make a few more attempts with the staff.

MS. RUSSELL: We had also talked about the possibility of trying to do something on the Hill that would let us recognize those members of Congress who are still sitting who were involved in the original legislation as a way to give visibility, when and how that might fit into it. But generally you can't get those people to travel, so we may need to take that to them.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Well, and even getting them to come to something. Unless you tell them that you're going to have a plaque to give them, they don't even come to something on the Hill. It's hard. Everybody has their own rigid schedules.

Sometimes they can work things in and sometimes they can't. It's just a mistake to think, oh, we'll have it on the Hill and we'll get everybody there.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It doesn't work that way.

MR. WILLARD: There are only three. It's Ted Kennedy, Ted Stevens, and Patsy Mink are the three people who were sponsors of our legislation who still are there. I also have a list of all the other sponsors who are still living and a number of them live in the Washington area. As I said, Brademas just fortuitously, I had an interaction with him. I would think that he would be a key player. We wouldn't want to do anything if he couldn't be involved in it.

Also, there may be some just outstanding speaker that you could have as sort of the linchpin for the event. Maya Angelou comes to mind, someone like that, who members of Congress would want to be with.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: In other words, you're thinking in terms of doing some kind of a lecture followed by a reception?

MR. WILLARD: That would be a good format, I think.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: And have it at the Library of Congress.

MR. WILLARD: Well, I have to admit that the format that we used for Jeanne's memorial seemed very workable. The theater is just perfect and then having the reception area right beside it. But we haven't done anything more than just conceptualize at this point.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: But if you like that idea, then maybe we could look at you and your committee identifying a speaker and a subject and we could go forth to explore this further.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Well, I've lost one of my committee members. Could we say who -- I can't remember. It was Mary and I can't remember who the third one was.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Under tab C.

MR. WILLARD: It's Joan, Martha, and Jose.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: So maybe we'll just go ahead with what's left.

MR. WILLARD: Rosalie, would you -- I'm going to ask you to take charge of this and work with Jack and see if you can schedule a telephone meeting of that committee within the next couple of weeks.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Well, I think that takes care of that. We're doing very well and we are now at the next item of business, and it starts with the committee list.  
NCLIS COMMITTEES/PROGRAMS/PROJECTS UPDATE:

COMMITTEE LIST (REVISED)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: So if you will turn, please, to tab C, there is a revised committee list and I'd like you to look at it and see if people are comfortable with it.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Perhaps Joan should probably be on the list for my committee also, if you think she would be willing to do that.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Probably. I will speak to her.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: And of course, anybody who wants to volunteer, we'd love to have you. She's not here, so I won't volunteer her.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Who?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Joan.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: You will notice in looking at the revised committee list that there is no longer an Audit or a Personnel because that has been rolled into the Executive Committee. That seemed to make more sense.

Are people comfortable?

(No response.)

Nobody's saying a word.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, okay. And staff, we'll be back to you to talk about some of the things that are happening and what it is that you need to do.

Actually, both Joan and I sort of end up sitting in on some of these committees just by virtue of the fact that we're the Chair and the Co-Chair, the Vice Chair, and we sort of have to know what's going on. There is one committee here that I think probably is very close to coming to closure, Jose.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I guess I might comment that, since I notice we have other members of the public besides the committee and staff on a couple of the committees --

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Those are the ad hoc committees.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Yes. So could it be appropriate to have an official observer or something on the Public Access to Government Information Committee? They can observe, I guess. What I'm hearing is we don't put on standing committees people that aren't Commissioners, is that it? I guess I never thought of it that way.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: That's correct. You can always observe, but the idea when you look at an ad hoc committee or a working group is we're there to listen and to get input. We're not there to drive the show. That is not a proper role for a Commissioner on this type of a working committee.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I guess I would rely on Mr. Horton then to make sure that no one feels like they couldn't observe anything that the Public Access Committee did. Specifically, there are some large stakeholders in the issue that I keep running into that I hadn't thought of before.

MR. WILLARD: I think you'll find from a process -- and we'll be talking about it -- that we've done two things. We've gone out of our way to make sure as much participation by observers can take place. At the same time, we got a legal opinion out of the Department of Education that we didn't have to do that. But I certainly believe strongly that, if we're representing the people, that the people ought to be participating as much as possible.

I think I am also a believer that sometimes there needs to be a framework in which off the wall ideas can be discussed, and sometimes that can't be done in the public because we find it's in the headline the next day. But balancing those two interests is something we're very sensitive to.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Well, I am not myself currently a dues-paying member of ALA, not because I feel there's an actual conflict, but because I think it might not be helpful. But when I looked at the committees that were set up under the Public Access to Government Information and examination process, I think I recognized most of the names. I didn't see that, for instance, VODOR was participating in any official capacity and that shocked me and surprised me. I suppose a lot of thought was put into it. But I don't know, have we heard from VODOR?

MR. WILLARD: That may well come up in the discussion. It's on the agenda.

#### LSTA REAUTHORIZATION

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, that will come up.

If there are no other comments on the committee assignments, let's go on to LSTA reauthorization.

MR. WILLARD: We talked about it a little bit in the other meeting. Let's just recap. There have been two meetings so far of the task force that has been put together by

COSLA and ALA to begin the process of deciding what should be the public input to the legislative process.

LSTA runs through September 30th, 2002, and there is no legislative vehicle right now and it wouldn't make sense for there to be one, but the next Congress is the one that will be dealing with that. Clearly, the interest groups that are affected by it -- the library community, the museum community -- have got to start thinking about what they're going to ask Congress to do.

We also, as a statutory body that has the broad responsibility of providing policy advice to the Congress and the President on library and information needs of the people and the specific responsibility of providing advice to the director of IMLS, clearly this body needs to be involved in that authorization.

As Martha made clear this morning, we attend the -- it's a fine distinction, but we attend the task force meetings, but we're not a part of it because it would be inappropriate for a government agency to be a part of that lobbying effort. But nonetheless, we consider it very important to maintain the connection. So as long as they're willing to keep inviting us under those ground rules, we will continue to attend. I think the next meeting is a week from Wednesday. Martha and I will be at it.

But I realize that didn't say anything substantive about the legislation itself, but I think that's where we are.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Emily Sheketoff, who is the head of the Washington office for the American Library Association, has joined us. Do you have any comments, Emily?

MS. SHEKETOFF: I totally agree with Bob. I think that the task force sees both the NCLIS representative and the IMLS representatives as observers. We appreciate your advice, input, and we feel that you will be able to advise people in the future by knowing the process that we've gone through as we move towards our idea of a recommendation.

The task force was put together so that we could get consensus within the library community about how we hoped LSTA would look in the future and what we hoped it could help accomplish. We do have a pretty good consensus, although not unanimous, in the library community and we are moving forward hoping that as we come together with some ideas and some success stories that we can in fact ultimately be successful and unanimous in moving it forward.

But that is a wish. We are not there now.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Do you have any questions, further comments on this particular process?

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I'd like to add, just following on from the discussion we had earlier on today, I do think it's important for the library community and the museum community to come together, as you said, before the end, but not quite a bit before the end, so that there is mutual support for the perspectives that each bring. They may already be very close, but I think that will become very important as the reauthorization actually moves through.

MS. SHEKETOFF: I'm sorry, I had something else this morning. I missed the discussion. Was there a discussion about museums becoming a part of LSTA?

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: No, no, no, no, no.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: No.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Just a coming together in the legislative examination process.

MS. RUSSELL: Because the umbrella legislation covers both museums and the LSTA, that as the last time we moved together, and both groups need to be supporting to get it passed, and we would assume the same model would apply this time.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Beverly.

COMMISSIONER SHEPPARD: I was just going to say, the museum community is beginning the process and then there is the point where the two must come together for the overall umbrella Museum and Library Services Act. But there's a lot individually to be done first.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Very much so. But you know, communication is really quite necessary so the left hand knows what the right hand is doing.

MS. SHEKETOFF: And the sooner the communication begins, the easier the process is.  
SISTER LIBRARIES, A WHITE HOUSE MILLENNIUM COUNCIL PROJECT

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Rosalie and Beth, would you like to give us a report on the Sister Libraries program, please.

MS. VLACH: Surely. As usual, we're going to be a tag team, and we just want you to know that we had a meeting with Joan before she left last week just to make sure that we covered all the things that were important to her.

Actually, the first part of the project, which is choosing the libraries, designating them, matching them, and presenting them with their plaques, soon will be over and we'll be into the next part. But to date we have 146 libraries that have been designated and the note that I have here in what you have received says 10 libraries still to be matched. It's

fewer than that. Beth was working very hard this morning and we have fewer than five now that need to be matched of this current group.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: That's U.S. libraries or foreign libraries?

MS. VLACH: It means that the U.S. libraries that we have -- we have only three now -- to be matched with foreign -- or I shouldn't say three.

MS. BINGHAM: Five.

MS. VLACH: Five.

Often it's easy, but sometimes it takes up to a year to do that. It takes various attempts to match. Sometimes it just doesn't work.

One of the things that Dr. Challinor wanted us to -- it's very important to her, and we obviously agree, and that is that if we leave any libraries that we've designated unmatched that will be a poor reflection on NCLIS. So we're working very hard to make sure that that doesn't happen.

The fourth round will close on October 16th. That will be the last round of applicants that we will review, and we will begin matching those libraries. We wanted to do it by the 16th of October so that it would have to be during this administration since the Millennium Project is a Clinton initiative. We will begin in November then to start gathering the information. Simultaneously, of course, with matching we will be gathering the information that will be required for the report that we intend to do, and we will be making recommendations in that report as well.

We've gotten a great deal of positive feedback. Joan Challinor has spoken and wherever our booth has been we've had very good results. We are very encouraged by it.

We've explored several options for the handoff of the project. As you know, last time we said it was very successful, we didn't want to just let it drop, and I think everyone agreed. Beth has looked, has talked with ALA. Their international relations roundtable has a Sister Libraries program. The way theirs works, however, they're having only 5 percent staff time with it. It doesn't seem like it would be a good fit.

I must tell you that Woody Horton has been in touch with Joey Springer at UNESCO. They have expressed an interest in taking over the project. At this point we feel that we should continue that discussion. However, we also understand that it has to be at a higher level than we are. So we will, once we have Joan and Bob and Bob we will ratchet it up and see if perhaps it can go there.

MR. WILLARD: A reminder that, since it is a Millennium project, it continues through the Millennium period established by the White House, which is through December 31, 2001.

MS. VLACH: Yes, yes. So we do have time to do a lot of the last minute things.

Since the last Commission meeting, we have developed a new brochure which lists our participating libraries and also lists the foreign countries and cities that are part of the program. We're constantly updating our web page.

In fact, we have gotten some very good press in the magazine "Public Libraries." Three of our sister designated libraries were interviewed and they were extremely positive about the program, so we were very pleased.

Also, as a result of that kind of publicity, Leonard Kniffel, who's the editor of "American Libraries," has also expressed an interest in having an article appear in his magazine. So things are really very positive as far as that goes.

Joan spoke at the international relations roundtable at ALA. She's also going to be speaking in Saratoga, New York, at the New York Library Association talking about Sister Libraries. Our tea in Chicago was extremely successful. We had about 125 people -- libraries, Commissioners, and various friends, and again Ann Molod, who is a very important supporter of that financially.

But we were able to introduce -- just a little aside. We were able to introduce a librarian from Urdenheim, Pennsylvania, to someone from Juarez, Mexico, and they hit it off and they began actually laying out the project that they plan to work together, and it has continued. So there's another value to our teas.

We hope to have another tea in January some time during the midwinter ALA meeting.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Those little teas show a lot of work. I know it's a small budget and not a lot of time and encouraging people to come, but it was marvelous.

MS. VLACH: Right. This is the woman who has organized and has put it together so beautifully. It's hard to imagine, but I've been told, since I've only really been involved in one, that each one gets better. So I imagine in January she's going to blow our socks off.

MS. BINGHAM: Not on my budget, I don't think.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: It's already a miracle, but it's very nice. It's wonderful.

MS. VLACH: Speaking of our miracle worker here, Beth is now going to talk to you about what she did at the IFLA booth.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Can I ask a little bit about our web page?

MS. VLACH: Yes.



COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I carried those "Kids on the Internet" things in my pocket and sometimes I say to people, go to our web page. Well, it's only available in pdf format. Can we put that "Kids on the Internet" thing also available in text? It doesn't have to have the pictures and stuff, but is that a toughie or what?

MS. RUSSELL: I'll check. It's not a toughie to do. I thought that we had a version of it there in text.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I don't know what "pdf" stands for, but I figured I don't know how to do it. A lot of people say: Geez, I went there and it said I've got to push on this button and my thing doesn't do it. I mean, some of the longer things we can. Like the hearings, that's what pdf is for.

Then apparently in some of the systems when it's pdf you can't just download it through Adobe or something. You have to put it into a file and then transfer it and then call the kid down at the high school or something.

MR. WILLARD: I love it when you talk technical.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Actually, the high schools are a long way away in Montana.

MS. BINGHAM: Let me talk a little bit about IFLA. I have to piggyback on what Bob said. Thank you so much for giving me the opportunity to go to a part of the world I would never have gone to. I might come back, unlike some of the other places I have been.

Our booth was in an absolutely perfect location. We were the brightest thing on the exhibit floor. We had air conditioning, and let me tell you, in Jerusalem that was extremely important because the people in the basement had no air conditioning for a couple of days. I told Bob, I said: Look, if ours goes, boy, I'm packing up and going home.

Since Joan couldn't go, she deputized Ann Molod to help me with the booth. I didn't expect any assistance, but I had Annie from morning to night. She was right there with me. She was a quick study. And I had Bob and Martha dropping by frequently. Now, I know it wasn't to visit with us or to sit in the chairs, I do know that that is not the reason they came by the booth. But it really impressed people that were attending the conference that people of their stature were there waiting to meet and to greet and to talk to people about the National Commission.

As I say, we come from things in a different background of our expectations, but the ones of you that live in the Beltway -- you have very prestigious jobs -- do not understand how

much people out in the hinterlands are excited about meeting dignitaries from Washington, and especially the National Commission. It does something for them. To be able to talk to them about projects was very exciting to them.

I have to thank Woody because when we were talking about the booth design last March for our premier event he said: You need to have something like Pin the Tail on the Donkey; you've got to have something to make them want to come in. So we came up with a world map with blue and red dots, and the people from the emerging countries were mesmerized. The first thing they did was walk to that map and: Well, there's nothing for me, especially in Africa. And we didn't let them put their own dot on, but we handed them an application packet and told them that hopefully the next time the booth appeared that there would be a dot for them.

So it's very important for high-level visibility for there to be some activity going on. The explanation of the program is very simple. Again, to our amazement, we had very few questions about people wanting funds, equipment, or anything like that. They just are hungry for information. They're hungry for information exchange.

I was telling Judy, I guess yesterday, I did more reference at IFLA than I have in 30 years of work on the library front lines, because everybody would listen about the program and then they would start in about what they really wanted and how to do it. Basically, it was directing people to know where to go to look for what they needed at that particular moment.

I ended up with a lot of cataloguing questions or just referrals to different people in different arenas. So there was a lot of follow-up to do. But it was interesting that that was some of the things that they are thinking the U.S. National Commission can do, is to find them somebody that can help answer their questions, to be a directional point, which is another type of international assistance that I don't think any of us really and truly ever think about.

Of course I've written everybody that stopped by the booth and left me their name and their card and invited them to talk about the project. Today I actually was able to find four people from IFLA that are willing to work with libraries.

What I have left to match -- and I'll just tough this out -- is I have five middle schools that I am desperate for people from the school community. I have been to every library association in the world that has a school or youth group, the educational components, whatever. But if you have any leads or have any friends that have been overseas or whatever, that their children have attended a school, please get me that, because middle schools and elementary schools, it's difficult to find information.

I had an extremely great conversation with the American University librarian in Paris and she's the incoming Chair of the French Library Association. They, despite the fact that we've been in contact with them for 18 months, this was a brand new project. So she was real excited about going back to get people to help us.

The thing that amazed me, too, and I have mentioned this every place we've been with the booth, people are drawn in because of the splash, the red, white, and blue, the large signage, Ms. Clinton's picture. That brings them in. But then they start touching all the documents about the Commission.

There is such a desperate need for a slit brochure describing all the varied activities of the Commission, because that's what they want. The teachers of library science from around the world were mesmerized with the big publications. They wanted them all. They really and truly were just amazed that so much was being published and being done in so many different arenas. So that was kind of interesting.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Did you give them all away?

MS. BINGHAM: I gave what I had taken, because we didn't take a lot of the big publications. But we gave away everything that we took.

Oh, that was the other thing. Everything arrived on time and intact, so that was kind of nice. As I say, we directed people to the web site for information. When we ran out of applications we had to run off an additional 60 while I was there.

There were a lot of people that really and truly wanted to talk. I met people that I had met in Bangkok last year that told me they're still thinking about it. But everybody thinks they all have to be a completed packet and they have to be something wonderful. But it was really amazing to see people that remembered us from last year.

We had two U.S. librarians that are actually part of our Sister Libraries program and they came and talked at the booth a little bit to people and it was just like, oh, did you hear this, that, or the other. There was a gentleman from Africa who went out and just gathered everybody that he knew and brought them back to show. So they were actually doing their own kind of recruiting for us, so hopefully we'll be able to follow up with that.

In the little printed report, I had them scan in a picture of my worker bees that were walking to work. We were actually on our way to the old city, but it looked like a good group.

Ann, as I say, was just a tremendous asset. We were able to have some real good dialogue with people from Egypt, because we had had a request for an Egyptian library. I was able to go there and visit a member of the libraries there. I think that the one thing -- before I had gone to IFLA, I was in San Francisco on business and had gone to one of our Sister Libraries locations there. I had offered the librarian in San Francisco at a high school library a library in Australia to pair with and she turned me down. She said: My students are not smart enough to communicate with students in Australia.

It really kind of irritated me because, let me tell you, this matching process is a difficult situation. I've had one of my schools that I haven't found yet I've offered five places to and she's not taking any of those, either.

But I decided that, well, let me go and see what this school looks like. Maybe I'm not understanding where she's coming from. It's the John O'Connell High School in San Francisco. Well, you know, I'm directionally challenged. I don't know left from right and driving is a chore in the city for me. But I managed to find it, and I almost was in tears because I was so depressed when I left the location.

It was a terrible area. You think of the international third world countries has having such poor library service, but this school had newspapers in the windows and it was just the most depressing place I had ever seen. I thought, here we are, we all think that we have everything to offer and we want to showcase what we have.

It turned out it was an alternative high school and the librarian did not put anything in her application about it. It wouldn't have mattered. It would have been wonderful to know that. But I think that not only were the students perhaps not as advanced as she wanted us to think that they were, but she would also have been embarrassed perhaps to exchange pictures or information from her locale. I'll use that. I'm going to call her next week and just have a little talk, have some conversation.

But the reason I brought this up is the fact that a lot of people have had some questions of the good of the project. Many of our locations that have been designated as White House Millennium sites by the U.S. National Commission have been able to go back and leverage local community support because of this fact. I'm hoping that perhaps as we wind the project down we can take some of these tips and tools and get out to the communities that need them.

Because that's the other thing. We are serving a different -- it's a different type of project in that it really is a people-oriented project. people need to be spoonfed and told stuff. But we also need to help them leverage within their community. But it was a really interesting thing to see something that I assumed a school library in California would be okay, but it wasn't. It was very, very depressing.

But other than that, the projects rocket along. If anybody knows anybody -- Pilot Point Middle School in Pilot Point, Texas. Jack, I might give you a call. Maybe you can go convince them to accept one of the partners I have sent to them.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: That's only about a hundred miles.

MS. BINGHAM: But hopefully we'll be able to pull up all the matches. Now, there is one library I don't know if we'll be able to help. It's the Indian reservation library that we designated in Belport, North Dakota. The librarian has quit, so they're really looking for a librarian, and their total budget is \$15,000, so they have a little bit of a higher level

agenda. That's the only one I don't think I'm going to be able to find. But who knows, we might be able to get something.

Do any of you have any questions? I'd be happy to answer.

COMMISSIONER TABB: I would wonder why you're being so persistent in helping someone who's so difficult to please.

MS. BINGHAM: Do you know Dr. Challinor?

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER TABB: If Joan were here I would say the same thing to her. I think there does come a point at which this becomes really an irrational process. That's my only observation.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: One of the things that Joan and I talked about before she took off for California is, as the Millennium Project ends, whether it goes to UNESCO or not is moot. But in the process of the final report and looking at what has happened, a how-to based on what we have learned, so that it becomes something that anyone who wants to do a sister library project will have sort of a small manual: This is how you go about doing it. Because we then will have had two years of practical experience.

But taking it to the point of actually producing it in the official languages of IFLA --

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Hopefully with some help.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: With some outside help, oh, yes. So I think it has been a very good project. I mean, the time that I spent in the booth was just phenomenal. People, the questions, and I haven't done reference work in ten years and it was "How do you." So I know what Beth was talking about.

Again, I would like to say how much I personally appreciate the support this project has been given by my sister. She really has turned out to be I think on Broadway you would say an angel.

Are there any other comments or questions for Rosalie or Beth on the Sister Libraries project?

(No response.)

MR. WILLARD: I would just like to add something.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes, Bob.

MR. WILLARD: I am just so pleased with the team that we've got now with Rosalie full-time on staff. Many of you may forget, but Beth has another job. People in Baton Rouge are counting on her also. So we are exceptionally benefited to have her enthusiasm and communications skills. It's just a delight to watch her in the booth. Her enthusiasm just shines.

So I just might take this opportunity to thank both of them for all the hard work on this project.

MS. BINGHAM: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you. We all, I think, on the Commission concur with Bob's statement. It's been a pleasure and, aside from the work in the booth, Beth and my sister and I had some interesting experiences at the hotel that we nicknamed "the hotel from hell."

I think next will be Denise, the library statistics program.

#### LIBRARY STATISTICS PROGRAM:

##### 2000 PUBLIC LIBRARY INTERNET STUDY

MS. DAVIS: Well, I want to apologize for not having photographs scanned, but I couldn't find any happy people completing surveys.

(Laughter.)

I'm only kidding. Maybe next time I'll be able to find some poor soul who's actually laughing hysterically while answering the survey.

It has been a very busy spring and summer for me. The way I've organized my report is by putting -- the first two items on the list are actually items that I need action on at this meeting, and then the rest is merely an update.

I do want to correct something. For item number 6, the Fourth Northumbria International Conference, it actually happens before IFLA, not after IFLA. So just a minor change there.

The first is an update on the 2000 public library Internet study, which is actually in your binders under tab D. This is the summary findings of Burteau and McClure along with the tables that we requested. The action item -- oh, and in addition there is a second phase of that work was to continue discussions with database vendors who provide full-text journal content to libraries to determine from them, of the measures that Berteau and McClure have been working on with public libraries for measuring use of electronic resources, which vendors could supply which measures and getting them to actually admit that and put it on paper.

So we were actually able to get that accomplished this past spring. That is also included in the report. Although it's not officially part of the Internet study, it was a subpart of the work and I wanted to have that available to you because it actually leads into some additional work that we need to make some decisions about doing.

But my question for you today in regard to the Internet study is, it became extremely clear, as you will note from the findings, that public libraries are pretty well connected. We expected that finding. So the decision now is to think about what we're going to do in the future, what is it about access to the Internet that we want to know.

We asked them deliberate questions this year about what money did you use to pay for your Internet access, were you training your staff, were you training the public, services to persons with disabilities, did you have hardware and software, those sorts of things.

You'll find as you review the figures in John and Chuck's report that a little more than 30 percent of public libraries have hardware and software to assist persons with disabilities. This was an area that we knew about last year. We have confirmed it in the sample study and it may be an area that we want to direct our attention next year as part of the Commission's research work.

So what I'd like to ask you is, who wants to work with me developing some guidelines on how we want to move forward? Martha and I have talked about this. I could just point at the statistics group and say, because you're on that, that team, that you get to play. But I did want to open it up because there may be people who are interested and are not part of that, or those who are on the statistics group that don't want to or feel they don't have the time to move on this.

I don't think it's going to be a lot of work. I imagine even a conference call would do it. But we do need to set some direction, because it's very clear that the Internet study that we've been doing for the last six years is done.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Has come to closure.

MS. DAVIS: It's done and we need to think very seriously about how we move forward.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Well, I'm on the statistics group, but I'm also interested. I in a recent interface with the Gates Foundation found out that they're showing a little bit of flexibility on that, and they've also, at the request of a library, put in a Spanish language library as well as some other kinds of accommodations.

So I think that may be the last thing we have to track. As I understand it, you can get the whole set of them now for under a thousand bucks that handles almost all the disabilities. It seems like we should be keeping that on people's frontal lobe.

COMMISSIONER MASON: What is this, software?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: There's also different size screens. Generally, you also add a scanner so that a person with a sight handicap can scan something and then the program makes it big letters. So in other words, for less than \$1,000 you can take an existing station and make it accessible to almost all the people that can get to it.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I'd like to stay involved in it, too. I hope we can get down to -- the real question to me is what the Internet's being used for, chat groups, or how people are actually using it. We've made some steps in our library, not very successfully, I think, to find out exactly what the value of it is. I think that's a really crucial issue for us in the next round of looking at what's going on with it. So keep me on your list.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Jose.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I'd like to be involved, too.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: One of the issues that sort of intrigues me -- and this goes back to the whole question of information literacy. You know, that's my soap box these days. But we have a lot of access now, at least in the public libraries. I'm very interested in terms of beginning to investigate what's happening in school libraries, how technology is being used, what kind of access to the Internet, who is training the teachers, where are the computers, how does it interact with the school library, is technology money being used just to keep connectivity and therefore you're not buying books?

I think these are some very important issues that need to be looked at.

MS. DAVIS: Actually, I can speak to that a little bit. It's not on this announcement because the study hasn't started yet, but I've been asked to sit on an advisory committee for the National Center for Education Statistics for a longitudinal study that's being done of tenth graders and then again in the twelfth grade to look at achievement measures, increasing test scores basically.

But what we've been able to do very effectively, thanks to Jeffrey Owings, who's now the associate commissioner of one of the divisions within the National Center for Education Statistics, is actually get a library, a school library media survey included in that longitudinal study. So they'll be sampling 56,000 public and private schools, high schools.

Not only are there questions to the students, to the parents, and to the teachers of the students in math and English and language about their use of the libraries. There is also a library media specialist component that's a separate survey instrument. And that was in addition to that. He was able to get funding -- it was a lot of funding -- to get that extra instrument put in.



The instruments are being field tested right now. It's a group of about 20 of us that are advising the study. So it will be very significant.

Now, also we're looking at five years from start to finish, because this next year is the field test of the instrument, then in 2002, end of 2001, beginning of 2002, they'll actually begin the study of the tenth graders and go through that whole process, and then there's a break and then they'll be twelfth graders and then they measure them and then there's a follow-up year. So it's the whole span is five years for the study.

But that is moving along. In addition to that, there are systematic surveys that are done of school media centers. There's one in the field right now that's completed.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: There is another issue that was brought up at the meeting this morning that I feel very strongly about, and it has to do again with access to information on the Internet and the security of the information that has been digitized, how do we know that someone hasn't gotten into a database and corrupted it.

So I don't know how one goes about looking at that, but I think we ought to at least think about it.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I remember Walter Anderson talked about that. They fired some people in his organization for fooling around with some database.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: That's right. So I consider these to be serious concerns.

Do you want to go ahead, then, and add Jose to the committee? We'll set up some kind of a conference call.

MS. DAVIS: Yes, and I'll be in touch by e-mail to coordinate a time for that.

The other piece of the discussion will be, these are minimal findings. What do we want to do to bring more attention to the findings? I haven't received the raw data file yet because John has tried to compress it and I can't receive it, so we're still working on that. I may get a zip disk. It's huge, it's a huge file. Thank you very much.

The next item that requires action is back in the spring Betsy Sywetz of IMLS, now no longer with IMLS, I'm very sad to say -- she's gone on to renovate a farmhouse in New York. I don't know why she wanted to leave Washington to do that. But she had approached both myself and Sandra Shirley of the ALA Washington office to draw our attention to some work that was being done in the community access, the CTC, community technology center, offices at the Department of Education, and specifically with a gentleman named Norris Dickert, who was interested in building a single database to bring together information about where people could go to access technology, not only community technology centers but also libraries and so on.

Maurice Trevilion was a representative on a task group that we pulled together to have about a half-day discussion about what were the issues that we needed to deal with. What has basically happened with that is it is rolled into -- it has moved away from being let's find out where these things are to a rather elaborate plan that's being taken on by the American Library Association to work with external funders to actually build a database, to actually make this thing happen.

So at this point my question to you is what, if any, role does the Commission have in this project. We serve largely an advisory role and now that it's turned into a full-fledged project that's pretty much being managed by the Washington office at ALA, I want to get some guidance from you on how we could proceed.

MS. RUSSELL: Denise, wasn't part of the issue, too, trying to be sure that when Ed was working on the things they were doing with community technology centers to be sure they included libraries?

MS. DAVIS: That was a large part of it.

MS. RUSSELL: And that piece has happened.

MS. DAVIS: It's gone. The project's turned into something quite different than I think it was originally intended. Part of it was just to bring visibility to libraries and that's still there, but it's turning into a larger, a much larger project which we really don't have the resources to support in any way. It's the strong efforts of ALA to find outside funding that's moving this all forward.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: This goes back to a meeting that actually happened serendipitously between myself and Bev Lynch when we ended up stranded in the Minneapolis- St. Paul Airport. We pulled some people together, and Shirley was at that meeting and then she -- I am delighted, because one of the things that the Commission is supposed to do is to facilitate and I think we started the process. We brought people together. ALA stepped in, the Washington office stepped in, and they're moving ahead.

I think that it's just great. But I don't see any role for the Commission any longer. I'm just delighted to be able to hand it off to Shirley and say: Anything we can do to help you, we will be delighted to to the best of our ability, but we're delighted that you're moving ahead with this project, and thank you.

MS. SHEKETOFF: You might want to know that there is a big public relations effort that launches in January with professionally done advertising directing people who have not yet experienced the Internet and the joys of surfing the net, targeted to kids from the sixth to tenth grade, encouraging them to go to the library and call an 800 number.

The 800 number will connect them with operators who have access to the database which can then direct them to the closest facility that offers Internet access to the public. So you

will start seeing those ads in January, although probably they'll be on television programs that nobody in this room watches. But they may be brought to our attention.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Those of us who no longer have kids on school. But you, of course, Jose.

So what is the pleasure of the Commission? Do you feel that we have done our bit and we started with a baby and it has grown up into a teenager?

MS. DAVIS: No, it's walking now.

COMMISSIONER TABB: I think the strategy proposed is the right one at this point, to hand off.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Great. Then take it and run with it, and we thank you.

MS. DAVIS: Well, I'll e-mail Sandra Shirley next week. Actually, you'll get to her before I will, but I'll confirm with an e-mail and just let her know.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We are delighted. I love to see things like this happen because it proves that the Commission is really meeting its mission, which is to facilitate, to bring entities together and to see something happen. So thank you.

MS. DAVIS: The last, at the risk of spending any more time, you have my report. If you have any questions let me know. But one other thing that I did hand out, Mary Jo Lynch -- Monday I was in Chicago. Tuesday I was in Chicago, too, because of the weather, but it wasn't intended that way.

Mary Jo Lynch mentioned at an academic library survey training session that the digital divide e-rate report that ALA had sponsored was available, and she mailed this to me and I found it today on the ALA Washington office's Office of Information Technology web site. It's under telecommunications, but I had copies made and unfortunately I'm Xerox machine-challenged, so the staple is this way and the holder on this side. So don't put it into your binder and expect to be able to read it because it will be backwards, so my apologies.

But I did want you to have a copy before you left. I will be sending out an e-mail to everyone with the URL listed and there are additional copies in the back if the guests didn't get a copy.

A very interesting report. I will draw your attention, though -- do skim the front. It's very good. But get to the back because this is the real grist for the mill. What I find interesting is that if you look at this in conjunction with the Internet study that these same gentlemen did for us and you look at this in tandem, there are big correlations here. So things that we discovered in our work are reinforced here when they look very closely at

the funding issues: Where are libraries getting the money that they're spending to stay connected, what are they doing to move forward in closing the digital divide?

Some assumptions that I was making based on the results that we have from our Internet study are at least proven out a little bit more here through focus group discussions. But I think there is a lot more to be done to really get at them.

With that, I will end my report.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you.

Any questions for Denise?

MS. BINGHAM: Can I make a comment? You know, I'm dabbling in a number of conflicting projects around the country and building consultants and planners and people that are working in public libraries especially and in schools could not do their work without the statistics that are out there and are available through the efforts of Denise and the projects that have been going on.

It just is incredible to see how we're pulling in tables and we're making ourselves look so good, like we have done a tremendous amount of work, and it really is not all that difficult if you know where to look. But it has to be gathered, it has to be continued, and it has to be marketed that it's out there to be able to use.

But it has just been truly invaluable. I'm doing a project again, Jack, in Bandera, Texas, which is a third world country, by the way. But as I said, the statistics have made it very, very easy in using the state library reports and the correlation of the different cities and the comparisons and things. It is just incredible, the data that's out there.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you.

We're at a point now on the agenda when we are supposed to take a break. However, we have not yet heard from --

MR. WILLARD: No, it's intentional.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It's intentional.

MR. WILLARD: We continue with the same agenda after the break.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: So at that point I will go ahead and say we will take a 15-minute break and we'll come back at 3:15. Woody, at that point you will make your presentation.

(Recess from 3:05 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.)  
GOVERNMENT INFORMATION  
TECHNICAL

ASSESSMENT OF FEDERAL  
AND THE FUTURE OF THE NATIONAL

INFORMATION SERVICE

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I would like to bring this back to order. We are beginning to lose Commissioners. Woody, are you ready?

MR. HORTON: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Bob, do you want to say something first?

MR. WILLARD: I had the good fortune of welcoming some participants of this study last week. We had one of the working groups that Woody will define more correctly was at the Commission and I was asked to say a few words. I appreciated the opportunity because it made me look back a little bit, and in many ways the very first thing that I ever got involved in information policy back in 1978 was an initiative to rewrite that part of the U.S. Code that deals with the Government Printing Office, but really has a much broader mission in terms of sharing federal government information.

That made me think about all the initiatives that have taken place over the years, things like the Paperwork Reduction Act and the Grace Commission and the reinventing government and the A-130 bulletin or circular, rather, out of OMB. The Commission has been there through much of this activity.

I mentioned this morning, or rather in our report, about our intended plan to reissue the public sector-private sector task force report. Now, I was just a hanger-on. I was one of the liaisons at that time. I sat on the outside of the room when the Commission was dealing with that issue and it made me feel good to pull that off the shelf and see what a great piece of work the Commission had done.

They say that success has many parents, failure is a bastard. Well, success, I'm sure that in the weeks and months to come the effort that Woody is heading up for us will be looked upon probably in the same way as the public sector-private sector task force. It is one of the significant activities of this Commission and it really has grown out of just little things.

Certainly you can't go to a strategic plan for two years ago and say that we would be engaged in a major project that had deep Congressional interest in it and yet we are. It has grown out of the efforts of the Commission back three or four years ago when we were at San Diego to start what we referred to then as the GPO project. It came out of that serendipitous development of the Secretary of Commerce deciding that NTIS's business problems could be solved by a little organizational shuffle.

Now we've got well over 100 individual volunteers all putting their shoulder to the wheel to help us as a body come up with some recommendations that the U.S. Congress could then move forward, we would hope, in terms of taking that most American, uniquely American, idea that we as citizens own the information that the government has assembled on our behalf and it's up to us to do with it what we want.

But we need to do it in a rational, economically sensible, societally beneficial way. The effort is just one that I am very proud to be part of.

We also think we are all very lucky that Woody Horton continues to come out of retirement to help us on this wonderful project. So with that, I'd like to turn it over to Woody.

MR. HORTON: I'd like to just talk mainly about the process rather than the substance, because Bob has briefly covered the background and we are meeting at a point approximately halfway through the project. That is to say, we got word from Senator McCain's Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee asking us to do the study, I think in June, about six weeks after our March final report on the NTIS situation, and then, as you know, a little bit later in another month, in July, Senator Lieberman, the ranking minority member of the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee joined Senator McCain's request to us in asking for the study. Since then, we have also gotten support from the House side as well.

We established four panels to look at the four major facets of the challenge. The first panel, under Peter Urbak, a former Director of NTIS, is going to come up with recommendations for how to strengthen the business model which we said was flawed when we did the NTIS study. That is to say, it's rooted in a paper era and we're now in an electronic era, and one of the reasons NTIS was losing money is because their business model was based on a paper era.

The second panel is chaired by Curt Mulhoney, who's the Administrator of the Defense Technical Information Center and is also the president of an informal consortium of scientific and technical information like NASA, Department of Energy, Defense, and so forth called CENDI, C-E-N-D-I, which is an acronym for those agencies.

He is looking at the internal needs of the federal government and its agencies for better sharing information that the government creates, inter-agency sharing, if you will. They are an important customer, as a matter of fact, and they all agree they don't do a very good job and they have a lot of overlap and duplication in what they do. So he's kind of looking at it from the internal government standpoint.

Then we have Dean Marian Drake, who is the Dean and Director of Libraries at Georgia Tech, which is, most of you know, one of the countries again most intensive scientific and technical information institutions, and a former President of the Special Libraries Association. She is looking at ways to better meet the needs of all the groups external to government, which is a very large, diverse, and heterogeneous group of many kinds of

people and individuals -- public interest groups -- the depository library program is a customer -- and citizens and business and so forth and so on.

Finally, the fourth panel is under the direction of Wayne Kelly, a former Superintendent of Documents, and they are looking at new partnership arrangements between the public and the private sector in the Internet age.

So all four are at work, and we decided the strategy we should follow is try to let them have as much authority and take the lead as much as possible, with only general guidance from us. For example, Peter Urbak has not had any physical meetings. He has preferred to do it electronically with the members of his panel, whereas the other three have held one or more meetings.

The other reason was that we didn't honestly want to influence or try to shape the debate and the discussion. We would prefer to let each one of those panels come to us with their findings and their conclusions and their recommendations, looking at the same general overarching challenge, which is how to reform the federal government's laws, policies, and programs governing the way it disseminates information to the public, but looking at it through the eyes of their respective mandates, which from the four I just went over, which are quite different.

Now, the trick, of course, is going to be to synthesize all this when we get those reports, which by the way are due October the 15th. We're at a point, unfortunately, where they're still in the throes of shaping the findings and conclusions. I might tell you, there is a lot of heat on some of the panels because there are strong differences of opinion on which way to go. Luckily, those four people are very strong leaders and I think they're doing a bang-up job so far in managing the work of their panels.

The panels have anywhere from 10 to 20 people on them and, in addition to the four panels, we ask a so-called board of experts composed of a dozen, now approaching 15, leaders in the information field, such as information lawyers. For example, we have Henry Parrott and Raymond Nimmer, who are two of the country's information law experts. We have got Christopher Burns and Paul Zurkowski, whom you know are pioneers in the information industry. Christopher Burns has written a wonderful paper which is on our study web page called "The World Wide Library," and if you haven't seen it I highly commend it to your attention. I think it's creative, it's very innovative, and Chris told me in a message just this morning that he's had four companies come to him who want to design the world wide library idea, and he's asking us advice on how he should deal with the situation.

MS. DAVIS: Ask for lots of money.

MR. WILLARD: And remember the gift fund.

MR. HORTON: Those experts are doing two things. We've asked them to write an issue paper, sometimes called a white paper, that addresses an issue for which they have some

special expertise or experience. Chris Burns just happened to be working on the world wide library idea when we approached him, so it was timely to explain his experiences.

The second thing we've asked is for them to critique the final NCLIS report when we put the four draft reports together from the standpoint again of their respective expertise. So in addition to the information lawyers, we have information economists, we have information policy experts, we have some academics, and so forth.

I mentioned October 15th is when the final reports are due in from the four panels. We will then turn around and try and put it together and get it out to the board of experts and other reviewers by November the 1st.

One of the most exciting things to me about this project is the fact that we are attempting to use the web itself as an interactive bulletin board and post as much material as we can, often in draft form, and deliberately inviting public review and comment. So it's not unusual for me to get a call from a librarian or an information professional somewhere in the country who has looked at one of those documents and said: Oh, I have some comments I'd like to give you and they're in no way formally or officially connected with any of the panels or the project.

So I don't know how many people are doing this around this town, but to me it's very exciting that we should be able to do that. One of the problems, candidly, that has come up is that, because we have given the panel chairs as much leeway as we thought we should, in some cases stakeholder groups have felt that either they were underrepresented or not represented at all on some of the panels, and we've had some discussions with the ones that we've become aware of what feel that they are underrepresented.

We've taken the position that we don't want to tell the panel chairs who to put on their panels, but what we have done is to try and tell those stakeholder groups who feel that they are underrepresented on the panels that they can do several things. They should identify who on the panel they might be able to work through and pass their comments to, so that they do get on the table in the deliberations that are taking place.

The second is we have promised that the reports coming from the panels and these issue white papers that I spoke of will be posted on the web. So we strongly urge all the stakeholder groups to "tune in" periodically to the study NCLIS web page to see what has been posted and that way try to keep up with the developments.

I can tell you it's kind of like riding herd in a nine-ring circus. Every morning I have over a hundred e-mail messages that have come in. And I believe we can stay on schedule, but I don't yet have and I can't yet share with you exactly what the major issues are going to be. However, I know there will be some major issues that are going to require this Commission's attention, and I've had some conversations with Bob and with Martha about the desirability of some kind of an interaction, be it a conference call or a meeting, along about the first week of November when we have our draft report in hand.



For example, one issue I do know about has to do with a proposal that's been made in the first panel about creating a new central public information resources organizational element in the government that might consolidate the superintendent of documents, NTIS, and some other programs and functions around the government.

Obviously, that's a controversial recommendation. We have people pros and cons on that and there is no consensus at the moment, and it may well come to a minority report sort of thing. But we want that panel to rattle with it for the moment and come to us with their best judgment.

But that is the kind of issue that this Commission may wish to address in a policy sort of vein: Does the Commission want to take a stand on that kind of issue or simply stand back and indicate in appropriate disclaimers in the report to the President and the Congress, which by the way comes out December 15th, that we do not necessarily endorse the recommendations that have been made by the panels and study members. That's one possible option.

So I ask you, Martha, to consider that issue. As I say, the timing would be somewhere around the first week of November when the draft issue would come out.

I'm going to stop at that point and ask if there are questions of any kind.

COMMISSIONER TABB: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TABB: Are there explicit charges to these four groups that are more detailed than what we have here?

MR. HORTON: Pardon?

COMMISSIONER TABB: Are there explicit charges to the four working groups?

MR. HORTON: Yes. They are to look at our so-called study plan outline, which is also on the web, which is the charge we were given by the Congress, and within the goals set for us by Senator McCain, to which Senator Lieberman's committee have added a few, to come up with concrete findings, conclusions, and recommendations on how to strengthen the federal government's laws, policies, programs, and practices, bearing in mind that particular panel's unique perspectives.

For example, the second panel dealing with internal government agency needs would be focusing on sharing and how to improve the sharing mechanisms as between agencies to minimize overlap and duplication.

The other thing we've said is please do try to put on the panel, either as a panel member or as an observer -- and we've allowed the observer possibility -- as many of the

stakeholder groups as you can, realizing in the case of panel three that poor Mimi Drake couldn't possibly put 200 stakeholder groups on her panel. So there is a tradeoff there between so many interested groups and how many.

I think in every case I'm aware of she's either -- if there has been a heated discussion, she's either turned around and put somebody on the panel or put them on as an observer.

MS. RUSSELL: One of the things once that came up, looking for example at the business model thing, there isn't so much an explicit written charge, although there have been some documents written by the individual panels which are up on the web site, but for instance in talking with Peter and the other people on the panel about how might you look at recommendations on revising the NTIS business model, we've said to them, you know, you really need to look at the whole range of government sales programs, because if we're looking at this in terms of overall government information policy what we don't want to do is have another thing where we've got one solution for NTIS and a different one for GPO and a different one for Census and a different one for USGS and a different one for whoever else.

So the fact that it's put in this broader context is driving each of them to look at it a little bit differently. But probably -- even those initial papers came very early on, sort of a straw man for each of the panel chairs to sort of challenge the thinking of their panel members, so they don't necessarily represent what the decision of the panel is going to be or anything, but may be more like a throwing down a gauntlet and sort of saying, well, this will get your juices flowing, get you thinking about it.

But the charters were pretty broad to them in the sense of -- well, like Curt, who is supposed to be looking at not only having agencies share, but what do the agencies need for services from other agencies. There are lots of agencies who rely on NTIS and GPO and other organizations because they can't for one reason or another or don't choose to for one reason or another do their own internal dissemination to the public.

One of the issues that I'm posing on NTIS is, well, what do you expect those people to do? I mean, if EPA has relied for years on NTIS, do you expect them to suddenly be able to develop the staff and the capability in-house and is it really cost-effective to replicate that in every agency and so forth?

MR. HORTON: Another interesting idea that I might mention because I think it is exciting is a number of people are recommending that we in turn recommend the notion of what is sometimes called a life cycle information manager software package, so that when you or I or a government official creates some kind of an e-mail message or a document that there will be in that software package a series of profiles with defaults that automatically take care of, automatic based on the views and policies of the central information agencies and the laws of course, questions like is this going to go to the federal depository libraries, is this something that should be permanently publicly accessible, is this something for which an official record should be created, is this something that fits within one of the exemptions of the FOIA or the Privacy Act.

One could go down the line with several dozen of those. You can see what a flow chart might look like. And by building in defaults, you automatically take care of the plain vanilla option when you create that document. Right now there is no icon that you can click on that does that. As a result, we get into all kinds of discussions all over this town with people who are taking it up piecemeal. This group is dealing with permanent public accessibility, this group is dealing with authentication, this group is dealing with preservation, this group is dealing with permanent records retention, and it's never put together, that the technology would enable you to.

I think the life cycle information manager is something we could recommend that would have great benefit to federal agencies in simplifying and speeding up their task.

MS. RUSSELL: In fact, that's very much what we're trying to do with our own records management, to reach a point where when we receive or send an e-mail message we can, if you will, cc it to an archive folder if it's something that warrants being preserved and segregate it out right then, or if you save a document that's the final report or an interim piece of a contract or some significant document, to save it at the same time that we save it for working papers to move it and isolate it. So that's sort of an interesting way of moving towards trying to do that at the time that you create the document, when you're most likely to know what's authentic, is this really the final version that went to print or not, those kinds of issues.

COMMISSIONER TABB: One other question. I inferred from what you said that if you wanted to have someone added to one of these committees the person to contact is the chair.

MR. HORTON: Is the chair, right.

COMMISSIONER TABB: The other, last comment on this is that I've been contacted by GAO, which of course is proceeding, as directed by Congress, to also do a study about the transfer of Superintendent of Documents. I don't know how this will come together or what the schedules will be for the report that they're doing, which obviously very much relates to this as well. I always hate it when the government itself is undertaking these parallel but unconnected investments.

MR. WILLARD: Parallel but connected.

COMMISSIONER TABB: Parallel, maybe connected.

MR. WILLARD: No. We have made sure. We're very closely in touch with GAO.

COMMISSIONER TABB: Yes, GAO, but not necessarily with the committees that have commissioned the GAO study? We should talk about this.

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TABB: We run a risk, I think, also of getting into the internecine committee warfare if we don't.

MS. RUSSELL: Woody sent letters out to 80 or 85 senior Congressional staff, both House and Senate, both Republicans and Democrats, to be sure they were all aware of what we were doing. We've gotten feedback from some of them. A lot of them are staying aware in the background, but we're forwarding information to them. But we're very much aware that this is --

COMMISSIONER TABB: There are many agendas afloat.

MS. RUSSELL: Oh, many, many agendas. And as many committees as there are, every one has a piece of the whole information policy thing, and it's their turf and they're very conscious of it.

MR. WILLARD: In ancient history, Woody and I and a number of other people worked on a publication called "Understanding U.S. Information Policy." Among other things in that, there was a segment that had committee jurisdictions that dealt with information policy. I'll just guess at the number, but I think we were focusing on subcommittees and I think we came up with something like 175 subcommittees that had a piece of information policy responsibility.

COMMISSIONER MASON: I remember that.

MR. WILLARD: All of which are subject to change in January, not just the people but the jurisdictional issues.

MS. RUSSELL: But I think the SUDOCs issue and the depository issue are key to this, because if we're looking at overall government information dissemination clearly the depository program is one of the major programs for dissemination of public information and information to the public.

MR. HORTON: Connie Morella and Tom Davis, as you know, have also asked GAO to look further into the NTIS situation. So I think the point's well taken. We should have some further discussions to make sure when they come together that we don't have a lot of surprises to spring on people.

COMMISSIONER TABB: Or that we know when they're not coming together, whatever it is.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Are there any other questions or comments for Woody on this issue?

(No response.)

Thank you. And we will talk about getting the Commission together in November to work on some of these issues and come back with direction.

We are now down to Commissioner Activity Report.

MS. VLACH: Legislative Update? I plan to be very quick.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Where did I miss you? Oh, yes. Sorry about that.  
LEGISLATIVE UPDATE AND PUBLICATIONS REPORT

MS. VLACH: I didn't intend to take too much time anyway, basically because there's an awful lot of activity but not an awful lot of things coming to fruition. Basically, a few things I did want to mention. Bob's mentioning John Brademas -- the first thing I have on my little report is that Tim Roemer has recommended or has asked to designate a facility of the U.S. Postal Service the John Brademas Post Office, and we have been in touch.

It passed the House in June and it's been referred to the Senate and Congressman Roemer's office expects Evan Bayh to move it through the Senate before the end of the session, but we're not sure. They're going to keep us informed. Should there be an opportunity for us to support that effort in any way, we'll let you know.

The other piece of legislation Bob also mentioned was our appropriation. Just wanted to point out that there have been 150 amendments to that piece of legislation, and the last action was that it went to conference committee.

Two titles in there that I thought would be of importance, I guess basically to understand that a lot of the smaller bills or the other bills that I had mentioned in previous Commission meetings have been incorporated in some of these that I'm mentioning. Title 6 and title 7 deal with the filtering. Basically, title 6 says that schools and libraries are ineligible for discount rate unless they have filtering policies in place.

In title 7 it amends the Communications Act of 1934, which is universal schools -- the title of it is "Universal Services for Schools and Libraries." They require that libraries, elementary and secondary schools receiving universal assistance to certify that they have installed a system or implemented policies for blocking Internet access to matters inappropriate for minors.

The other piece of that is, which I thought was interesting and I put it in a separate quote: "Require the school board, library, or other responsible non-federal authority to determine what matter is inappropriate for minors."

MS. RUSSELL: So there's a certain amount of local control.

MS. VLACH: Right, absolutely. But how it's going to turn out we're not sure.

The appropriations for the Leg Branch, which of course we've been following because of the GPO issue. Yesterday the House agreed to the conference report and that was the latest action. They've been meeting on that.

The Elementary and Secondary Education reauthorization bill is to reauthorize through 2005. Again, that has some relevance to libraries. I haven't really gone through all of it or haven't listed it. We have to just wait to see.

Recently, the Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Management and Information Technology, held a hearing entitled "Establishing a Federal CIO: Information Technology Management and Assurance within the Federal Government." They had testimony from OMB, GAO, and from the CIO, Vlisik, who is with the Department of Treasury.

I know that when Judy and Woody were recently visiting on the Hill they had some conversation about that. I don't know if you want to expand on that.

MS. RUSSELL: They told me that they're not expecting to actually introduce legislation when there's a month to go, but they're beginning a process in expectation of introducing a bill early in the next Congress. They feel that they'll have some support for it. They haven't yet identified, from what they're saying, a champion on the Senate side.

MS. VLACH: I'll tell you that Roll Call has said that they think the Department of Labor-HUD appropriations will possibly be held hostage. So we don't know what's going to happen, but who knows what's going to be held hostage and what isn't. We'll see.

In terms of publications, I just wanted to let you know that Denise and I are working on a small pocket guide, statistical pocket guide. I meant to bring a little mockup that I had, but I left it in the office -- one of the disadvantages of meeting offsite. It will just have graphics and a little bit of text, and it will be very small, something that we can hand out, hopefully will be useful.

That's it.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you.

Are there any questions or comments to or for Rosalie?

(No response.)

#### COMMISSIONER ACTIVITY REPORT

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Then we're down to the Commissioner Activity Report. I sent everyone a report of my activities and my IFLA will be forthcoming when I get home. We had a report that was sent out. Rebecca, you sent out an excellent report on

Reforma. Have there been any other activities that the Commissioners want to talk about? Winston?

COMMISSIONER TABB: I've just been appointed to and attended the first meeting of the new UNESCO commission to help create the national library of Latvia, which is a very interesting process, the only national library in the former Soviet Union that exists in concept but has never actually had a building and a central place to actually be a library.

So it's quite an interesting process of how this country sees the creation of a national library as being indispensable to creating a national identity. It's quite impressive to be in a place like this, where so many people from the government as well as from the private sector turned out to show their support for this.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Great.

Jack?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Nothing.

MR. WILLARD: Speaking of national libraries, can you tell us a little bit more about -- there's a convocation of national librarians coming?

COMMISSIONER TABB: We have three more bicentennial symposia to go and one of those is a meeting the end of October focusing on the past and future of national libraries. It's really a two-part symposium. The first part is also co-sponsored by the Society for the History of Librarianship, and there are a number of papers being given more about the history and role of national libraries. Then every national librarian in the world has been invited to come for the entire time, but particularly for the second, the third and fourth days, to talk about the future of national libraries. We have about probably 60 national librarians who are coming altogether.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Great. When is that?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: What is the date of that?

COMMISSIONER TABB: October 23rd to 26th.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: It sounds fascinating.

COMMISSIONER TABB: I hope it will be. It's going to be like the United Nations.

MS. RUSSELL: Yes. You're doing multiple simultaneous translation?

COMMISSIONER TABB: No, we're doing it entirely in English, with people bringing translators if they need, and we'll have Library staff on hand. It was just too complicated,

with only one person from each country, to try to even imagine what languages to do other than English, so this is what we had decided.

But we will have a large square table with flags, kind of like the United Nations. We want to make it -- and it will be not so much presentations of papers, but some demonstrations, but mainly discussions, really with the idea about new collaborations that national libraries might enter into together. I hope it will work. it's always risky.

MS. RUSSELL: Are you holding it at the Library?

COMMISSIONER TABB: Yes.

MS. RUSSELL: So you're going to the Rotunda or something to get a place big enough for 60 people to sit around a table?

COMMISSIONER TABB: In the Mumford Room.

MS. RUSSELL: Oh, in the Mumford Room.

COMMISSIONER TABB: It is open. People are welcome to come as observers. So we haven't made a big point of this because it was hard enough to organize, but it is open to anyone to come and sit around the room and observe.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Any other comments?

(No response.)

#### NEW BUSINESS - PROPOSAL TO ENDORSE THE UNESCO/IFLA SCHOOL LIBRARY MANIFESTO

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We'll go to new business. Under new business we have a proposal to endorse the UNESCO/IFLA School Library Manifesto. As you remember, we have already endorsed the public library manifesto. What I would suggest at this point is that we go ahead and look at this, read it, consider it, and we will wait, discuss it with Joan and the International Committee. Then if a decision is made to go ahead to recommend endorsement, we'll do a mail ballot.

#### LIAISON COMMENTS

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: With that, we have tried and true liaisons. Would you like to make any comments?

MS. SHEKETOFF: Well, ALA is busy finishing up our year. We are anxiously waiting for Congress to depart, giving us the full appropriation while dropping the offensive language in the bill.



Congratulations on getting halfway there for your bill. Good luck the rest of the way.

We are very involved, as I'm sure you realize from Denise, with looking at making Internet available to everyone. A lot of people are talking about the digital divide and a lot of issues impact on the digital divide. We feel censorship is of course one of them. Students who are rich enough to have computers with Internet access at home don't have to worry, but those people who are on the adverse side of the digital divide depend on the public library and the school library for their Internet access, and for them to have it restricted in some way we feel furthers the digital divide.

For them to not be able to get access to the Internet because their library doesn't have enough facilities or their school closes at 3:00 o'clock are other ways that further the digital divide.

So that ALA is working with a number of different partners to try and alleviate some of these problems, identifying where there are facilities available, and then coming up with creative ways to let people who are interested know where they can get access, and developing more access where it's needed.

We have, hopefully successfully, gotten the E-rate data from the FCC today and that will be part of the study to see just where public libraries are with connectivity, and that will help us realize where we need to focus more effort, and not just ALA, but where the library community is going to need to put a big effort.

We recognize that in a lot of places that's going to be places where connectivity is difficult -- Indian reservations, rural areas who don't have the facilities. The next step is going to be who doesn't have a T-1 line, a T-3 line, who doesn't have networking capability, so that at least we'll have a baseline of what's out there and then we can start dealing with what needs to be done.

Hopefully, in the library community we'll pull together and try and address this. But we the library community are not going to be able to solve it, but we should be in the leadership position of advocating for the public that needs it. We've always been there for the public for information and we need to continue. Even as information needs change and as the way information is distributed changes, we still need to be in the forefront, and it's going to be uncomfortable and some people don't really understand, but we need to educate them and we need to bring them along, and we're hoping that you'll continue to lead in that.

The other issues that we're involved with are government information, intellectual property, and UCITA. We've become very active in UCITA in the last few months. We are about to launch national training sessions. UCITA is a statewide problem, but the states are not prepared to fight it and it's going to have to be fought in each individual state.

So ALA, in consultation with ARL and a number of other library communities, has put together half-day seminars to train people in each state on what UCITA is, how you need to gather your community together, and the sort of do's and don't's of how you can go about having some sort of an impact. These seminars are going to be available at the regional library association meetings. There will be a special teleconference in December that is available to anybody who's interested in participating. There'll be a mid-winter conference on a Sunday afternoon of mid-winter.

But in the next six months we are going to be very active in offering this sort of training and I would encourage you as you talk to your colleagues to make sure that people from every state get trained, because once we go through this training for the next six months no one has the ability to keep doing it. So that it's not going to be enough to train just one person from the state. You have to train a few people and they need to be people with the time available to devote to this, because this is a very time-consuming process, but this is very important for libraries and information because if UCITA passes as it's currently constituted it will have very, very adverse effects for information.

That's what's happening in the American Library Association world.

MS. VLACH: Emily, are you going to have a list of places in this area that are going to teleconference? I mean, I know on the web site it said you might be able to join a local group for a teleconference rather than sign up.

MS. SHEKETOFF: As we know about them, we certainly make them available.

MS. VLACH: Okay, good.

MS. SHEKETOFF: Generally, we're trying to reactivate the same group that participated in the last ALA telephone conference, but we have not gotten them all to sign on yet.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you.

Are there any other questions or comments for Emily?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you.

Payton.

MR. NEAL: On the project that Woody Horton referred to a little earlier, I know that he raised the possibility that the Commission needed to give some thought to how the cover letter transmitting this to the parties in mid-December would characterize the Commission's participation in the future, endorsement or whatever. I would urge the Commission to try to do a face to face meeting with the four key task force chairs and such other of the representatives in those four working task forces.

I know on number four there is a vice chairman actively helping the chairman sort of divvy up the work into five or six different areas, with eight specific subtopics under consideration. But I do believe that once the final document, even in a preliminary form, in December goes forward, there will be a lot of genuine questions, certainly in the new Congress which organizes early in 2001, and I think it's going to be really tremendously important for the Commission members to be conversant with how a lot of these conclusions or recommendations were arrived at.

In the first NTIS study a lot of work and a lot of effort went into trying to reach a consensus. Very wisely, this document due in December was never characterized as a consensus because there were too many complex issues and there were too many stakeholders, many of whom are indeed at the table, but I would caution that there are just as many stakeholders standing away from the table and sort of watching and listening and interloping at all the discussions that are going on, because it will in most instances fall to the newly elected members of the Congress to take this legislation and these policies, some of which are coming up after having been through the Congress before in recent years, and in at least one case the requirement of a reauthorization of a major law will have to be considered in 2001.

So I think the Commission needs to have a full opportunity to be conversant with a lot of the effort that has gone into this. I will say, through Woody and Sara and Bob and Judy's efforts, the panels, the people that are working on this, at least those that have come forward out in the open, represent a tremendous pool of knowledge of all of these issues from the inception when I first ran into them over 35 years ago down to the present day, as well as some true visionaries of what the leading technologies will require the law to have to conform to or change and be adaptive of in the near term.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Any comments, any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Ann?

MS. PRENTICE: Two or three things from two or three of my hats. One, I'd really like to thank Bob for telling us his experience with Doctor Laura, the e-mail message. I shared it with my group and we found a piece of reality.

Secondly, ASSMT is very interested in the federal government information project and I'll keep them well informed.

Third, at the university we just hired Brian Caine, whom some of you may know, who is an information policy attorney, and he's going to be putting together an information policy center in the college. His work reinforces other things we're doing.

We also have on loan from the government for three years Lee Strickland, who happens to be the person who's responsible for the CIA for releasing information to the public and to NARA. This group of people, plus the Archives people, are very interested in government information activity as well. I'm having it available so we can see it as it moves as really information policy in action.

In an academic setting, this is extremely important because we work with our students who are interested in policy to see where it goes. We have some of the leading experts in the country working with it and it's a wonderful experience. Brian is at the college and he's now making connections all over the place. Brian was at Harvard. He worked in the grad school and set up their information policy work. He was at MIT and I think the White House, and we're delighted to have him.

Just so Martha won't think that we've forgotten all of our responsibilities, I just want to tell you we've hired Ann Carlson Weeks. I tried to hire her a long time ago, and we've got Ann with us and we think that really strengthens our school.

MS. DAVIS: Actually, that helps us a lot. It saves us in travel money. Thank you. She's right here now.

MS. PRENTICE: And she's very interested in some of the -- her questions, her research area that she's looking at, is how do school libraries make a difference. So I think I have it written down that I'll ask. You haven't called her already?

MS. DAVIS: No. I didn't know she had moved yet, no. She's on our steering committee, our advisory group for the school media center survey.

MS. PRENTICE: She's ours now.

MS. DAVIS: Well, we'll pull her in more.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: I have to tell you, we are delighted.

MS. PRENTICE: Just because we're in the policy areas and we're in the digital libraries areas and we're in computer action, that doesn't mean we've forgotten school libraries or public libraries.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: Thank you.

Are there any additional comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: At the very end under tab F, there are some things that I pulled off from the Internet that I think are very interesting, and they deal with -- one I took off Yahoo News, "Re-evaluate School Computers." There is another one that was

sent to me by a friend who does a lot of work with school libraries, that I had copied, and it has to do with a new book called "Fool's Gold: A Critical Look at Computers and Childhood." It's published by the Alliance for Childhood. I hope that you will read these articles because I think they are important.

With that, we will be back in touch with you in terms of some meetings, etcetera.

Bob, do you have any final comments?

MR. WILLARD: One thing Emily said reminded me, she said about the digital divide and people who have computers in their own home, just reminded me of something that, if you're able to see the Doctor Laura Show, it's an insight that you wouldn't see from the show. They do a surreptitious hidden camera visit to the Denver Public Library, then the kid who did it and her mother and father come on and talk.

The way that session is introduced, it says: When she's at home using her computer -- and they show her in her room using a computer -- her parents have some control over what she's doing. But when she goes to the public library --

MS. SHEKETOFF: Her home is filtered.

MR. WILLARD: Did they say that?

MS. SHEKETOFF: I think they did, because then they said: So when she does her homework she goes to the library, where she gets access to the information.

MR. WILLARD: When she goes to the public library she can have access. And then they start showing these dirty pictures.

Well, at the end of the show when we're standing around getting our mikes taken off, the father says: You know, you learn something new every day; I didn't even know they had filtering software.

CHAIRPERSON GOULD: We stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 4:08 p.m., the Commission was adjourned.)